The New REPUBLIC

A Journal of Opinion

VOL. XLI. NEW YORK, WEDNESDAY, FEBRUARY 11, 1925 NUMBER 532

Contents

The Week 293

Editorials

Outlines of a Debt Policy 296
The Living Lincoln 298
Babylonian Revels 299

General Articles

What Ails American Youth? ..... H. C. 301
Federalism as a Method ..... George Soule 303
Women and War ..... B. B. 306
The Last Phase of Anatole France. Edmund Wilson 308
Washington Notes ..... T. R. B. 310

Correspondence 312
Essentialism ..... Robert Littell 313

Reviews of Books

Constitutional Metaphors .... Thomas Reed Powell 314
Restoration Comedy ..... Virginia Woolf 315
Psychology Comes of Age ..... C. E. Ayres 316
The Shirt of Flame ..... E. V. 317
Little Novels of Nowadays ..... D. B. W. 317

The Week

SECRETARY WILBUR has broken loose again —this time with an effort to reassure the populace about "the next war." Alarming tales about the horrors of aerial warfare, the use of poison gas bombs, and attacks on the civilian population of large cities may be discounted, the Secretary asserts. He declares that "the next war is going on now," in China, and that it is of the old-fashioned archaic variety. It is impossible, he asserts, for airplanes to carry enough poison gas to kill all the inhabitants of a city. Moreover, treaties have been signed which need ratification by only one more great power, forbidding the use of poison gas. "To have a war," Mr. Wilbur magnificently explains, "one must have a defense. . . . If poison gas can be used on one side, it can be used also on the other. . . . It is certainly wrong to publish and proclaim these extravagant predictions as to the possible effect of future war. We have seen enough of wars. . . . The chances are that the judgment of mankind will oppose any war which has for its purpose the extermination or annihilation of nations or peoples."

EVERYONE is entitled to his opinion, including Secretary Wilbur. But it is regrettable, to say the least, that a man holding high public office should put the weight of his official position behind statements of this character, which are designed to lull the public into a false security, and are at best only half true. Secretary Wilbur is right when he says it is impracticable at present to carry enough poison gas in an airplane to kill off all the inhabitants of a great city. But it is entirely practicable, as one aviation expert after another has testified, to drop enough poison gas, incendiary and explosive bombs in a few hours' time to make a city virtually uninhabitable; to kill or cripple a large minority of the inhabitants; to start huge conflagrations which would take the lives of many more; and to terrorize those who remained alive to an extent which would render them helpless. The most sober, scientific survey of the facts shows that this is already possible. And in the meantime, the march of invention goes forward. No one knows what additional devices may be brought forward next week or next month. Nothing sillier was ever said than the Secretary's statement that "to have a war one must have a defense," and that "if poison gas can be used on one side, it can be used also on the other." To have a war, you need only a casus belli. No enemy has ever been known to withhold his arm because his opponent was ill equipped to defend himself. And while it is true that the new devices can be used by both belligerents, it is small comfort to those killed or maimed by them on one side of a frontier to know that similar suffering is taking place across the boundary.

EQUALLY unsound is Mr. Wilbur's contention that there is no need to fear "the next war" because it is already going on, in China and elsewhere, and is not so very bad. It is true that the new technique is not universally applied at present. This is partly because of the conservatism of the military mind, partly because some of the important secrets are still the exclusive property of the great western powers, and partly because in the type of guerilla warfare which has been seen since 1918, the leaders have hesitated both to bring down reprisals upon themselves and to alienate the local civilian population. But all these restrictions would quickly disappear with the beginning of another great war like that of 1914-18. Secretary Wilbur cannot be fool-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

ish enough to suppose that a nation which feels it is fighting for life will live up to an agreement against poison gas—if such an agreement ever comes into effect. It will be violated, just as all the other rules of war were violated under the spur of necessity. We should like to believe that "the judgment of mankind will oppose any war" which means the annihilation of a people; but such pious hope is a foundation too unstable to be relied upon. That is the sort of thing we used to hear before 1914. We have learned since then that the passions unchained by war conducted on the modern scale go beyond all reason. It is perfectly possible that not only one country but a civilization may commit suicide because it has started a war which it cannot stop. That danger is not made any the less by utterances so ill considered and unrealistic as that of Secretary Wilbur.

HENRY FORD, once an advocate of private operation of Muscle Shoals with himself as operator is now listed among those who believe the huge project should be conducted by the government in the general interest. If this is done, with special emphasis on the production of nitrates for fertilizer, he offers to turn over free of charge all the results achieved in three years' work by his own engineers on the fixation of nitrogen from the air, and to lend Uncle Sam the men "to help build up an efficient organization to run the Shoals." He declares that developing and maintaining "a great public utility and defensive asset . . . cannot be done under the system of private profit only that now rules business. It is a mistake to say that the government cannot run the nitrate plant as well as any private party. This is the very kind of business the government ought to engage in."

THIS new Ford offer is the severest blow which has yet been encountered by the Underwood bill, passed by the Senate, which would turn Muscle Shoals over to private exploitation on terms which, unless the Secretary of War could make a better bargain than the bill provides, would give away a hundred and thirty-five million dollar enterprise for an annual rental of less than $2,000,000. We sincerely trust that Mr. Ford's extraordinary influence on public opinion and on Congress may sound the death knell of the Underwood measure. We agree with him that the government might well engage in nitrate production. It might equally well undertake the development of the vast hydro-electric potentialities of Muscle Shoals. The two projects are by no means incompatible. They can, and should, be operated side by side.

HONESTY, courage and fair play in daily journalism have rarely been more dramatically exhibited than in the case of Mr. Henry F. Pringle and the New York World. Mr. Pringle, a reporter of the World, last year took a trip through the states to investigate the child labor question. His dispatches, he believes, made a good case for the federal Child Labor Amendment. Yet now he finds his paper editorially opposing the measure. Instead of changing his views with the changing winds, or keeping a convenient silence, he mustered up his courage and wrote a letter to his editors telling why he thinks they are wrong. His observation has convinced him that child labor is a serious evil, and that the states where it is worst will not, if left to themselves, eradicate it. And his letter ends with the challenge: "If this be treason—" But so far from treason does the World judge such honorable behavior that it printed his communication on the editorial page. While we agree with the reporter and not with his paper, we rather think that in the matter of candor the honors are even.

CHARLES R. FORBES, former head of the Veterans' Bureau, has been convicted in a Chicago court on the charge of conspiring to defraud the government in the matter of contracts for soldiers' hospitals. John W. Thompson, a St. Louis contractor and co-defendant, has also been convicted. The case will be appealed, however, and the defendants' counsel announce that it will be taken "to the Supreme Court, if necessary." We doubt that this promise will be lived up to. Forbes was one of the most stupid and callous members of the "Ohio gang" which descended on Washington in 1921 with the pleasant and well justified belief that the lid was off and the sky the limit. Forbes not only cut a wide swath, but did it so publicly that his activities could not be ignored nor hushed up. His career, which has been described at length in our pages, was an even more shameful record of wanton waste than of dishonesty. In two years' time he spent nearly a billion dollars; and about one-half of this went in graft and waste. The heartbreaking aspect of the affair is that the money which was thus scattered so lavishly among Forbes's friends should have been spent in caring for disabled veterans, many of whom were suffering extraordinary hardships because the government was giving them inadequate care or none at all. On the whole, we should welcome a retrial of the Forbes case in the higher courts. For the more often it is tried, the more often will the shameful story be reported in the columns of the press. It cannot be told too frequently.

THE New York Division of the Labor Defense Council has been investigating the question of political prisoners throughout the world, and estimates that in Europe and Asia not less than 250,000 persons are now incarcerated because of their beliefs. The figures listed include 8,000 in Germany, 3,000 in Italy, 4,000 in Poland, 1,500 in Rumania, 1,700 in Esthonia, 2,000 in Spain, 25,000 in India, 5,000 in Java, and many more in Japan, China, Korea, Hungary, Jugoslavia, Greece, Finland, Lithuania, Belgium, France and Portugal. While we cannot

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

vouch for these figures, it is undoubtedly true that a situation exists which no one would have dreamed was possible before 1914. While the Labor Defense Council does not mention them, a very large number of persons are suffering what are reported to be particularly serious hardships in the prisons of Russia. Efforts are now under way in New York and London to bring the plight of the latter group to the attention of the world and provide some amelioration through contributions of clothing, medical supplies and books. With these efforts we have the heartiest sympathy. It is probably asking too much of human nature to expect that in time of war or acute internal strife, the party in power will refrain from shutting its opponents up. But nowhere in the world, so far as we can learn, do such conditions exist today. Whether the number of political prisoners is 250,000, or a tenth as many, justice and respect for the opinions of decent mankind demand their liberation.

A NEW copyright bill is now pending before Congress so much superior in every respect to the existing law that it unquestionably deserves to pass. It was drawn at the request of the Authors' League of America by Thorvald Solberg, the Register of Copyrights, who, out of his own broad experience and without consultation with anyone on any point, prepared what can fairly be regarded as an ideal copyright proposal. Under its terms all literary and artistic productions are protected, automatically, as soon as produced. Such protection continues through the lifetime of the author and an additional fifty years. A badly needed reform permits the author of any work to sell separately various rights in connection with it—the right of publication, that of performance, etc. The author would also control the right of reproduction over the radio, as he clearly should. Present restrictions on royalties paid to composers for phonograph records and player-piano rolls, limiting them to two cents each, would be abolished. The proposed law would work no hardship on publishers, or anyone else honestly engaged in exploiting the work of creative artists. Particularly important is the fact that it would permit the United States to join the International Copyright Union, of which we are not at present a member. In short, there is everything to be said in favor of the proposed bill, and little against it. If Congress acted solely on considerations of the public welfare, it would become a law in short order.

ANOTHER battle for genuine collective bargaining is now in progress on the Pennsylvania Railroad. The Order of Railroad Telegraphers having objected to the "employe representation" plan of the company, the Railroad Labor Board held an election to determine the wishes of the employes. Out of 4,826 Pennsylvania telegraphers voting, 4,258 favored the Order, 318 favored the road's representation plan, and 250 cast scattering or invalid ballots. The Board therefore decided that the Order is the duly authorized representative. The company then summoned the local committeemen of the Order, all employes of the road, to the offices of the division superintendents, and interviewing them one by one demanded that they avow loyalty to the company's plan, which the telegraphers had just rejected by an overwhelming majority. On the refusal of the committeemen to sign on the dotted line, the company declared vacant their places as representatives, withdrew their passes and other privileges, and ordered a new election under its own plan on February 6. The members of the Order did not take part in this election, and trouble is brewing. Meanwhile Vice-President Atterbury has attempted to mislead the public as usual by declaring that the company insists on dealing with "its own employes" rather than with "absentee organizations" and by deploring efforts to "drive a wedge between railroad managements and railroad employes." Is it any wonder that railroad workers want a new law which will compel negotiation with the unions and acceptance of arbitral decisions? The policy of the Pennsylvania under the present law encourages not peace, but war.

THOMAS F. WOODLOCK, recently appointed to the Interstate Commerce Commission, has been a financial writer for the Wall Street Journal and the New York Evening Sun, giving special attention to railroad matters. His economic views as shown in his writings are more flattering to the dominant financial interests than those held by any economic authority of note. On railroad problems he sees eye to eye with the big bankers, and this is particularly true of the two most important issues now before the Commission—valuation and consolidation. Though Commissioner Mark Potter, whom he succeeds, is also a conservative, Mr. Woodlock is markedly inferior to him in practical knowledge of operation. Mr. Potter was an able executive before his appointment to the Commission, and had a thorough understanding of labor relations, being an intelligent advocate of coöperation between unions and employers such as is now in force in the Baltimore and Ohio shops. Mr. Woodlock's view of the labor problem is distant and conventional. If the whole Commission were made up of Woodlocks, we should have, not regulation in the public interest, but a mere official rubber-stamp for the policies of the private groups who control the carriers.

THE million dollar memorial fund with which the Phi Beta Kappa society proposes to celebrate its hundred and fiftieth anniversary will be put to highly desirable uses. A memorial building will be constructed upon the campus of William and Mary College where the society was organized. There will be also a statue of John Marshall, the most

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

famous member of the original chapter. The remainder, no doubt a substantial residue, will go to the foundation of various scholarships, fellowships, and other devices for the encouragement of excellence in collegiate studies. To encourage students to distinguished work is excellent; but to spur them to the accretion of credits as the price of recognition, as Phi Beta Kappa has always done, is a little dubious. Part of the anniversary efforts of the society might well be used not simply in encouraging scholarship but in considering how scholarship is best encouraged.

Outlines of a Debt Policy

As speeches on the French debt to the United States are hurled back and forth across the Atlantic, neither nation shows signs of following a policy that can bring any agreement nearer. We insist on payment, but not on full payment. France insists on reduction, but not on full cancellation. Yet there seem to be no accepted principles by which these two positions may be brought together in detail. Why should there be a reduction? What should determine its amount? Until these questions are answered, the debt discussion leads nowhere except to irritation.

It is certain that controversy over the moral obligation of the debt cannot answer either question. There is no measure by which comparative sacrifice and benefits in the War may be assessed. French lives against American lives, French security against American security, French annexation against American desire for world order—who can set up an account of such intangibles and come out with a balance which either excludes or includes the debt? If we forgive the French debt on such grounds we must also forgive the British and others. The burden of paying principal and interest on the ten and one-half billion dollars raised for the foreign War loans by American bond subscription must fall on American taxpayers, in so far as the Allied debtors do not pay it. If the Allies had asked us to appropriate this amount without hope of return during the heat of the War we might just possibly have done it. But to ask American taxpayers to assume this burden in their post-War disillusionment, merely as a sum morally due the Allies in addition to the precious lives and effort poured out during hostilities, is clearly hopeless.

A policy of debt settlement must look not to the past, but to the future. Its first essential is an admission that the debt is technically due. Once that is out of the way, we can go on to examine the realities of the situation. The first of these is France's capacity to pay. The second is the desirability of making the payments of which France may be capable. American taxpayers will assume the heavy burden of the foreign debt in so far as they are assured either that France, acting in good faith, cannot pay, or that payments would cause injuries which would counterbalance the benefits.

The first proposal of a settlement on the basis of capacity to pay is the suggestion that payments should depend on France's reparation receipts from Germany. We shall probably be asked to limit our demands to a definite percentage of reparations under the Dawes plan. It is true that French capacity does depend partly on what she receives from Germany. But this is not the whole truth. All receipts of the French government, and all its expenditures, have a bearing on any surplus which may be developed for the debt service. To tie up our receipts to one item alone is to ignore many relevant factors in the situation. Perhaps France can pay more than she receives in reparations; perhaps she cannot pay anything, no matter how much Germany pays her. And there is a peculiar objection to tying the French debt mechanically to the German reparation payments. As a quasi-disinterested party we have assumed administrative responsibility in the operation of the Dawes plan, for the good of all concerned. We should not be placed in the situation of attempting to collect from Germany the debt due us from France, absolving France of any responsibility in the matter. And we ought not, in our capacity as administrator of the Dawes plan, to become one of the chief beneficiaries of any receipts derived.

If a commission of French economists should meet an American commission to discuss without reservations France's capacity to pay, certain questions would inevitably arise. What these questions are, the discussions preceding the Dawes plan indicate. The first has to do with the stability of French currency. The fall of the franc has been temporarily checked, but only by a loan from American bankers. If the same set of circumstances should occur again, more such loans would be necessary, diminishing France's capacity to pay existing debts. Furthermore, progressive depreciation of currency would so upset internal economy as eventually to disturb any possible economic arrangements. A prime essential is therefore that French authorities should face a question which they have hitherto dodged. Is the franc to be stabilized? If so, at what value? Is an attempt to be made to get back to pre-War gold parity? Or must the present level be accepted? Or must the franc go still lower? To accept the present or a lower level of the franc would involve internal embarrassments due to final depreciation of pre-War investments, but it is probably the only way out, and a decision is necessary to French economic stability.

A second question is interwoven with the first. Unless current receipts of the French government balance current expenditures, the franc cannot be stabilized. Neither will any surplus arise for service of the foreign debt. France must work out of the deceptive practice of "balancing" her budget by means of new internal loans or by increased advances from the Bank of France. Such loans

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

merely give rise to an additional burden of interest charges which makes necessary a more severe reckoning in the future.

An examination of current receipts and current expenditures of the government logically follows. Current receipts arise mainly from taxes, excise or tariff duties, payments to France on her foreign loans, reparations payments from Germany, any profits on government railroads or industrial monopolies, sales of any surplus war material. Current expenditures arise chiefly from military appropriations, pensions, appropriations for reconstruction, service of the internal debt, ordinary civilian duties, and any losses on government enterprises.

Two other large factors bear on the situation. In so far as France loans large sums to foreign governments on poor security she diminishes the capacity either of herself or of those governments to pay the United States. In so far as she or her citizens have good foreign investments, her capacity to pay is increased.

Apart from the question of the capacity to pay is the question of transferring outside the country any surplus arising in France. Too large payments may upset the exchanges. Payments cannot be made in any case, without dangerously depleting any gold reserve on which currency stability may rest, unless France has an export surplus of goods and services. Good foreign investments owned by French citizens facilitate payments.

Within the realm thus outlined policy could be defined. Of course it is inconceivable that the United States could assume direct responsibility for French government finance, as a receiver does for a bankrupt firm or as the Allies have done for Germany. Nevertheless these are the realities which must eventually determine the solution, and they ought to be considered both in negotiations and in public discussion. American policy should concern itself with the principles according to which French receipts and expenditures are to be determined. What results do we want to bring about? We want, of course, as much payment of the debt as possible. But if we are asked to remit any part of that payment, we want our remission to contribute to objects of which we approve. These are, obviously, an economically sound situation, political appeasement in Europe, and the least possible burden on the working classes or other parts of the population unable to endure further sacrifices.

Suppose, for instance, France pleads, "We cannot pay, because we have no surplus." We answer, "You might have a surplus if you stabilized your currency and balanced your budget." France objects, "We intend to balance our budget, but even then there can be no surplus." We reply, "That is a question dependent on what you receive and what you spend. Let us look over the items. How about your income and profits taxes? Are you taxing as much of the private surplus as you can afford to take, without placing undue burdens on the lower income groups? And what is this item for Ruhr occupation? Do you need to spend as much on your army as you do? How about this loan to Rumania?" To which France may answer, "Our national interest does not permit us to change these policies." And we reply, "Our national interest does not permit us to remit any part of the debt in order to facilitate such policies." But if with these matters adjusted there still appeared no prospect of a surplus, and France said, "We cannot spend less on reconstruction, pensions are woefully small, we cannot make any profit on railroads without slashing wages, but we shall try to pay you by being more severe on Germany if you insist," we should reply, "We do not care to be paid at the cost of the sacrifices you point out. They will do more ultimate harm to all than good to us."

Or France might ask us a few pointed questions. "If we do what you ask, will sufficient private loans for working capital be forthcoming? What do you propose as positive measures of international appeasement and security in case we materially reduce our military appropriations? How do you expect us to develop an export surplus which will make possible the transfer of large funds as long as you maintain high protective tariffs against us?"

Naturally the negotiations would not be as simple as that. But the outlines of a policy do begin to appear when the problem is stated in such concrete terms. We should, before remitting any part of our claims, ask France to demonstrate whether or not she can really pay by stabilizing her currency, balancing her budget, maintaining adequate and properly apportioned taxation, evacuating the Ruhr, foregoing future military adventures either against Germany or elsewhere, reducing her army, and abstaining from political loans of doubtful security. We should make plain a willingness to remit, after such measures were adopted, any part of our claim or all of it, if it would necessitate undue pinching of expenses for reconstruction, pensions or civil obligations, or undue tax burdens bearing directly or indirectly on the workers. For our part we should be prepared to avoid an obvious error that mars the Dawes plan by fixing not only annual payments but a total sum of indebtedness, we should assure sufficient private loans to French industry and trade after a settlement, and we should in the meantime give earnest consideration to the problem of developing international security by other means than national armament.

Such a policy might mean a languishing of negotiations and a settlement indefinitely postponed. But if it were established and understood, it would exert strong pressure on France to move in the desired direction. The real obstacles to payment are also obstacles to the welfare of the French people. France can escape the consequences of failure to set her own house in order only by increased borrowing abroad, but such borrowing will be difficult until the War debt is funded. Thus the pressure gen-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

erated by our refusal to settle the debt except on sound principles will reinforce the internal pressure to establish national solvency. When that is done, the basis will exist both for a debt settlement and for any desirable private credits.

The Living Lincoln

IF Abraham Lincoln were alive, what attitude would he take toward the questions which are confronting American statesmen of today? This is the question which Mr. Nathaniel Stephenson, the most recent and probably the most trustworthy biographer of Lincoln, asked himself in the Woman's Home Companion of February, 1924, and he has no doubts at all about the adequate answer. He knows just what Lincoln would have thought about the problem of contemporary statesmanship.

Lincoln would, for instance, not have been a follower of Lenin or Trotzky. "Of humble birth though he was, he saw that distinction is as real a necessity to public well-being as is liberty. . . [He had] no toleration in him for Bolshevism, whether of the genuine or of the parlor type." "He was—he would always have remained—the inveterate enemy of privilege in every form." "He was a steadfast believer in representative government of the old sort where the ruler once chosen ceases to be the puppet of his electorate, and becomes a genuine ruler." "His thinking is a bulwark against the present tendency to obliterate local government, to absorb all the functions of government into one great centralized unit." "He would reform the world as the day dispels the night by imperceptible change, not by sudden shock." "He is a stern warning to all those Americans who today are for amending the Constitution with each new veering of the political winds." Finally "if ever the signposts of a great man's thought pointed all one way, it is true that Lincoln's signposts—his internationalism, his belief in the greater community, his desire to secure the lesser communities their individual life, his wish to restrain majorities, to substitute gradual for violent reformation, to safeguard the reserved rights of the world—all point straight to the League of Nations."

Such is Mr. Stephenson's outline of what Mr. Lincoln's political program would be, if he were alive today, and it may be worth while to pause for a moment and contemplate the exhibit. During the current week millions of Americans will celebrate Lincoln's memory and reverentially listen to official interpretations of his character and career. These memorial exercises will have for their object the projection of a moving image of Lincoln into the hearts of his fellow countrymen. Many of the people who listen to these speeches will wish to know what they should believe and how they should behave in order to give immediate vitality to the influence of their national hero. Mr. Stephenson's answer is that they ought to be intolerant of Bolshevism, in favor of the League of Nations, opposed to the amendment of the federal Constitution and so on. He is perfectly willing to proclaim in terms of these specific preferences what a resurrected Lincoln would stand for and what courses his fellow countrymen should follow in order to walk in Lincoln's footsteps.

He is adopting, we believe, a most questionable method of instructing his less informed readers as to what they should do to renew and perpetuate Mr. Lincoln's influence. Mr. Lincoln *is* alive today. His image lives more vividly in the consciousness of his fellow countrymen than that of any other modern political leader. But it lives, of course, a nebulous, intermittent and fluid life. It is born of social suggestion and depends for its direction and momentum in part on the interpretation which Mr. Lincoln's behavior and personality receives from the mouths of the official panegyrists. If, as is often the case, these expositors have axes of their own to grind, they more or less speciously attribute to Lincoln the particular causes and traits which they themselves are promoting. They try to guide his influence into the specific channels which they have dug for the drainage of their own lives. By so doing they falsify Mr. Lincoln's personality and sterilize the ferment which a better understanding of his life and thought might start going in the minds of his fellow countrymen. Mr. Stephenson, we are sorry to say, follows this vulgar and all too common example. He identifies the resurrected Lincoln with a few arbitrary specific or general attitudes towards current problems. His guesses are plausible. They may be correct. Nobody has any right to say. But a Lincoln who is presented to the imaginations of his fellow countrymen chiefly as an anti-Bolshevist, or a man who would be opposed to constitutional amendments, or who would be in favor of the League of Nations is not a living but a dead and buried Lincoln.

Abraham Lincoln did not bequeath to his fellow countrymen a Farewell Address; and no biographer or public commentator is entitled to supply the deficiency. His method of communication to the people of his own time was the spoken rather than the written word; and the spoken word belongs to the moment and to the occasion and to the speaker. His priceless legacy to his fellow countrymen does not consist of warnings, advice, rules of behavior or fingers pointing in the direction of particular goals. It consists of the revelation of a better way of life for political leaders in a democracy. There have been many political leaders who cherished grandiose visions of what the state can accomplish for the welfare of mankind, but extremely few who have not cheapened their personalities by their efforts to obtain and keep the power which they needed in order to put their vision into effect. Lincoln is supreme as a spiritual magnet. The popular appreciation of Lincoln discerns the presence

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

in him of this magnetic quality. It recognizes vaguely that he lives, not because his biographers can formulate his probable responses to contemporary needs, but because somehow he escapes formulation and yet remains an irresistible and imperative individual figure. The contemplation of his personality as a whole renders the attempt to hitch him to any particular post, or to a succession of posts on any particular street, second-rate and irrelevant.

Lincoln was, we believe, the first statesman in history who contrived to deal as a leader with the confusion, the conflicts, the recriminations and the treacheries of a bloody and prolonged Civil War in a disinterested and magnanimous spirit which added steadily to his own eminence as a man. He was a Cromwell who by his own efforts managed at the same time to become a Falkland. No man is born great as Lincoln was great. He was not a political genius in the sense that Alexander Hamilton and the second Pitt were political geniuses. The greatness which his career exhibited he gradually created by laborious self-discipline. He grew up among a people who were inconsiderate, headstrong, self-assertive, ambitious, impatient, quarrelsome, self-involved, easy going and undisciplined. He lived in their midst and was superficially indistinguishable from them. He loved, trusted and understood them. But in essentials he was not one of them. He was always in certain respects a lonely man, and his loneliness was the inevitable result of the differences between himself and his fellows which he recognized but at the same time overcame. It was his own disposition, as contrasted with theirs, to behave patiently, considerately, warily, disinterestedly and with his eye fastened on both the end and the means. Their comparative externality, worldliness and automatism threw him back on the resources of his own mind. In the circumstances he could not make a life for himself without conscious self-discipline. Yet this self-discipline, divorced as it was from any sense of grievance or of personal superiority, never transformed loneliness into isolation and alienation.

His very freedom from the interests, the obsessions and the self-satisfied aggressiveness of his own people formed an essential condition of his success in understanding their outlook and needs, and winning their confidence. He acquired the habit of combining participation in social and political activities with detachment from them. When he assumed the duties of President, he was prepared to consider the work of that office in the same spirit that he later recommended his countrymen to consider the "incidents" of the Civil War rather as "philosophy to learn wisdom from" than as provocations to personal approval or disapproval. There have been many saints who have acquired wisdom and fortitude by a life of self-denial and contemplation in some favorable retreat. Lincoln acquired it by his conduct of one of the most anxious, complicated, exasperating jobs in the records of political leadership. His magnanimity was born of a self-imposed unity of personality—of a marriage between a firm will, quick and deep sympathies, and a clairvoyant intelligence. It is this highly charged personal integrity which accounts for the wide distribution and the steady increase of his posthumous influence. He cannot continue to live his own life in any other incarnation. Those who try to keep his influence alive in the trivial image of an anti-Bolshevist or a pro-Leaguer are proposing to sacrifice his life after death on the altar of the great god of today which is Propaganda.

Babylonian Revels

THIS is the open season for freshmen. There comes a tide in the affairs of men when laws lose their force and the grip of righteousness is relaxed. For undergraduates that tide is now at the flood. From mid-winter to the first balmy days of outdoor baseball practice, but particularly during the semester examinations and the brief recess that follows while the faculty is reading the blue books, the curve of undergraduate wickedness mounts, and unhappy deans go wan and haggard about their constabulary tasks, chapter houses foam, and dormitories rock on their ivy-grown foundations. Every breeze brings fresh rumors of orgiastic revels. Freshmen, in an access of drunken frenzy, arrogate to themselves the privilege of sitting on the sophomore bench. Seniors grown desperate from all night gambling vociferously "call" their professors. All the world's records (indoor) for long distance "necking" are repeatedly improved.

Various theories have been advanced to account for this phenomenon. There is, of course, original sin: the undergraduate has an instinct for wickedness, a racial inheritance of loose living. But this does not account for the seasonal character of his outbreaks. According to the economic interpretation, these fluctuations should bear some relation to the business cycle, or the regular variations of a seasonal industry. The deflation of the football schedule ends in a period of emotional panic. Or the seasonal recurrence of examinations brings on a night shift, which passes from the regular overtime of cramming to the sweating operations of all night poker. The geographers offer also the inevitable climatic theory. In the intemperate zone, where most of our educational institutions are located, the winter is severest during January and February. During these months outdoor sports are impossible, except for the teams. The regular undergraduates are therefore thrown back upon indoor sports. That these are of a generally riotous nature is an accident of culture. A certain Wisconsin judge has discovered a condition in the chapter houses of the state university which, with a fine historical perspective, he has identified as "Babylonian revels." A clear case of culture diffusion. The climatic theory goes further. This is the season of congealed precipi-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tation: therefore, of snowballs. Professor Huntington, of Yale University, the leading American climatist, has no doubt already composed a monograph explaining the recent affair in which the Yale freshmen broke all the windows in all the dormitories—the most wantonly destructive act, we are told, since the seniors stole the fence. There is also temperature. It is cold. Woman is always most susceptible to extremes of temperature. Therefore the co-eds smoke. At Vassar, 433 of them.

Unfortunately these data are unreliable. Various special interests combine to distort the perspective. Like other primitive races, college students are not disposed to minimize their exploits in the telling. Nor are their elders more objective. Parents and professors are the most impressionable people, while the inhabitants of college towns seem inspired by the perverse mania of the undertaker's widow for every nasty detail of undergraduate delinquency. The story is told of a college president in a sweet little New England town whose citizens came to his office so constantly as self-deputized detectives to report the misdeeds of the students, that he invented the following stock reply. "Mr. President, there are boys in this college who gamble. Yes, sir, gamble." "Sir, there are men in this town who look in windows." Meanwhile, the newspapers, on half-rations as to collegiate sporting news, very naturally go hungering and thirsting after unrighteousness. And as they are avid, so is the student lurid.

No doubt each of these theories contains a certain amount of truth. College students are more or less naughty. They have a good deal of experimenting to do. Furthermore, they do love to shock their elders, and to figure richly in the popular imagination. Especially in the winter time, when there is nothing else to do. But behind all the trumpery of operatic wickedness there is another and totally different phenomenon, the tragic misunderstanding between age and youth. This is serious. The cigarette smoking illustrates it. The father thunders at his son, "Young man, do you smoke cigarettes? Because if you do, your allowance stops today." What should the answer be? The boy does smoke. He smokes cigarettes which he knows to be cleanly made, by the most reputable firms, of high grade tobacco and nothing else. He smokes under properly accredited auspices, in the college commons, in his chapter house, in the homes of his professors. Moreover he knows that when his father asks the question he is remembering that famous day and year ("Ask dad; he knows") when but one brand circulated and that in the worst society, when whispers went round of arsenic in the paper and cocaine in the stock, when lecturers described to awe-struck audiences how cigarettes were manufactured from cigar butts raked from the gutter by the trembling claws of opium fiends. When the father asks the question he is not raising a simple issue of fact. He means, are you a frequenter of pool rooms and saloons? Are you a loiterer in shady alleys? Are you an incipient dope habitué?

If it be a daughter, the issue is still sharper. In spite of the statistics of travel, it is still possible for a parent never to have witnessed undoubted ladies smoking cigarettes. Such a parent may be sincerely unaware of the tremendous spread of smoking among "upperclass" women. Smoking, to him, is the prerogative of the prostitute. When he discovers that his daughter has been smoking he treats her frankly as a lost woman. He takes her to a doctor to have her blood tested by the Wasserman reaction. Preposterous, you say. But it has happened. It is a possibility in thousands of families of high ideals and limited perspective. It is the crux of student wickedness. The wickedness of college students is very largely sheer misconstruction.

Very largely, but not wholly. Under these circumstances the undergraduate must misbehave. It is a moral necessity, an unavoidable responsibility for the education of the old—the heaviest responsibility children are ever called upon to bear. When adults make asses of themselves, when they show themselves incapable of perceiving the realities in the characters of their own children but insist on going on in vague formulas and antediluvian cant, then for the children to back down, for them to say, "Yes, I am all that you say. But I repent. I will stop," etc., etc., is sheer moral bankruptcy. No man, or boy, of any spunk will do it. There comes a point in the life of every youngster when the issue is presented to him whether he will follow the evidence of his own eyes and his own mind or the prejudices of his elders. When that point is reached he may seem to those elders to be bent on nothing but his own destruction, and to himself to be fighting the battle of his life for his inalienable birthright of independent judgment. Children are naughty because adults are stupid. Even college children. It is important to remember this during the "breaking months," when the Babylonian revels are going on.

THE NEW REPUBLIC

PUBLISHED WEEKLY AND COPYRIGHT, 1925, IN THE U. S., BY THE NEW REPUBLIC, INC., 421 WEST 21ST STREET, NEW YORK
HERBERT CROLY, PRESIDENT, ROBERT HALLOWELL, SECRETARY AND PUBLISHER, DANIEL MEBANE, TREASURER

EDITORS

HERBERT CROLY BRUCE BLIVEN ROBERT LITTELL
ALVIN JOHNSON C. E. AYRES GEORGE SOULE
ROBERT MORSS LOVETT

CONTRIBUTING EDITORS

JANE ADDAMS JOHN DEWEY R. H. TAW[illegible]
DAVID FRIDAY H. N. BRAILSFORD LEO W[illegible]

RATES: SINGLE COPIES, FIFTEEN CENTS; YEARLY SUBSCRI[illegible] FIVE DOLLARS; CANADIAN, FIVE DOLLARS AND FIFTY CENTS; FOREIGN, SIX DOLLARS; THREE MONTHS' TRIAL, ONE DOLLAR

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

What Ails American Youth?

AMONG the many discussions during the past few years of the behavior of American youth of today, a little book entitled What Ails Our Youth?* by Mr. George Coe of Teachers College, Columbia University, can fairly claim to be the most illuminating. He does not devote much space to drawing up the indictment or proving its assertions. He briefly summarizes the faults of the young people as a "craze for excitement, immersion in the external and superficial, lack of reverence and respect, disregard for reasonable restraints in conduct and for reasonable reticence in speech, conformity to mass sentiment, lack of individuality, living merely in the present and general purposelessness." Other observers would doubtless differ from him as to the precise terms of the indictment, but that there is something of this kind to be indicted none will deny. The differences will arise as soon as the censors seek to fix the responsibility for the prevailing faults and to propose means of correction.

Included in the indictment, as specified by Mr. Coe, there is one count which, in so far as it is true, increases the difficulty of applying a remedy. He charges American youth with a lack of reverence, meaning thereby a want of respect for the counsel of their elders and their teachers—the traditional social authorities. No doubt irreverence is an extremely serious fault in people who are supposed to receive salutary guidance from their elders; but there is worse to come. According to Mr. Coe their irreverence is justified. Their elders are the people who really require correction. It is not so much the youth who are ailing as the society into which the youth are born. Their faults are traceable less to relaxation of the old discipline than to the inadequacy and illusoriness of the discipline itself. The occupations and standards of adults and the meanings for life that flow therefrom are chiefly responsible for the aberrations of American youth. Fathers and mothers are losing authority over their children because the traditional instruments of authority no longer dominate their own imaginations or satisfy their needs. The education which they receive at home and in the school does not "deal directly, analytically and inspiringly with modern opportunities for a reasonable life and modern hindrances thereto."

The momentous aspect of contemporary life is, according to Mr. Coe, that it forces on the people of today not merely new facts but new choices; and for new choices they are morally unprepared. The education which Americans, both parents and children in and out of school, are receiving does not equip them to base their choices on an actually achieved knowledge of themselves or of the world. The development by education of the ability in the pupils to choose their route by virtue of authentic spiritual guidance is hindered by the still prevalent view that teaching is something done by the teacher to the student. Whenever activity by the pupil happens to be stressed in the secondary school or college, the emphasis merely calls for active attention to prescribed material. The teacher determines what the salient subject matter is in the particular region to which he is introducing his students. Not being himself aroused to understand how far the acquirement of trustworthy knowledge depends upon the opening up of new routes, he satisfies himself with calling attention to the old landmarks and with indicating their situation on the old maps. He is the willing servant of purposes imposed upon him by the dominant social traditions and tendencies. "He teaches what has been, or he demonstrates how this or that occurs; or he shows the way to this or that skill." "How different the teacher would be and how different would be the place of both student and teacher in the social structure if teaching were understood to be, first and foremost, the stimulation of students to a critical examination of the values of our civilization." But when American youth are educated on the assumption that education is a discipline imposed upon them by others for the realization of conventional ends, it is no wonder they are purposeless, unstable and vainly and trivially occupied.

Clearly from this introduction Mr. Coe cherishes an ideal of education which departs in one essential respect from the prevailing teaching in high schools and colleges. This teaching implies a body of knowledge and a social order which does not need to be watched and reëxamined by the student. It assumes the existence of an ascertained body of facts and principles, underlying the constitution of the world, the nature of man, the order of society and the conduct of life. The essential business of education is to impart to the students the facts and the principles and to convince them of the truth of what they learn. They are not trained primarily to search, to choose and to evaluate but to remember and to believe. Educators like Mr. Coe are no longer satisfied with such a conception of the subject matter and the process of education. They consider the body of facts and meanings which we inherit from the past as indications of a truth which is unfolding in human practice and consciousness and which would not continue to unfold unless each succeeding generation and each successfully educated individual were prepared to reëxamine its foundations and were disposed to doubt its conclusions. Education cultivates human beings who are capable of contributing to this unfolding body of facts and

* What Ails Our Youth? by George Coe. New York: Charles Scribner's Sons. $1.25.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

meanings. Unless the students are able to criticize existing social and moral values as a part of the process of studying them and as a preparation for choosing their own goal and their route to it, they will from Mr. Coe's point of view remain uneducated. He condemns as fatally deficient any technical or occupational training which is limited to the achievement of uncriticized ends.

Education which does not prepare young people to choose for themselves becomes a serious obstacle to the salutary mobility and versatility of human life. Mr. Coe seeks to place the energy of youth behind social progress, and to that end he wishes education to release the latent variability of human nature and particularly of the young. He does not believe that the "good" child or youth is the child or youth which obeys and imitates its elders with docility. He much prefers insubordinate young people who set up in life for themselves. It is they chiefly who introduce the novelty into living which, if it is absent, condemns to a sterilizing sham the pretence to moral individuality. Unless education can succeed in cultivating variability, it will be impossible in his opinion for modern civilization to adapt its institutions and traditions to the needs and unfolding of human life.

Mr. Coe attributes the present indisposition to cultivate the variability of youth quite as much, if not more, to the defects of religious as to the defects of secular education. It is, of course, the religion of any society which chiefly determines the behavior to which its members attach ultimate values. The Christian religion, as it is now taught, is in his opinion communicating to the young a stupefying toxin rather than a stimulating leaven. Christian teachers have not modified their instruction to meet the changes which the increasing fascination and success of secular occupations have introduced into the life of the Christian community. While they continued in their minds' eye scrupulously and loyally to preserve by education a faith once and for all revealed to the Saints, their religion in its actual application to life was being insensibly but radically modified by its necessary adjustment to an industrialized economy and a nationalized politics. Modern industry and the modern state have revolutionized the demands which aspiring human beings of today necessarily make upon Christian education, but hitherto only a few Christian educators have understood the need of developing the resources of Christianity in order to satisfy the demand.

Mr. Coe's discussion of what ails our youth culminates in a brief account of what ails our civilization. The values which modern civilization achieves are, as he sees it, narrowly distributed, the bases not being humanity, but race, class or sheer economic power. The youth of today are prevented from obtaining real freedom by limitations of opportunity, by defective education, by economic pressure and by governmental action. "When we think we are following principles, we have drifted into servitude to the machinery that we have created." "Religion itself has become institutionalized, unprophetic and self-deceived." "Education, as it is generally administered, gives insufficient encouragement to individuality, initiative, real thinking and judgment, and creativeness." Failing to assimilate the implications of freedom, it prepares the young to endure rather than correct the blunders of their leaders and elders. It is impotent to lead modern society out of partisanship, propaganda, class divisions and provincialism and self-satisfaction into a more humane, objective and invigorating moral and intellectual atmosphere. Its very dogmas and assumptions are no longer innocent in their complacency. The deepest scepticism of our own time is that which is embedded in the implications of prevailing conventions, customs and institutions. "It is the scepticism of maturity, not of youth."

Mr. Coe has no confidence in the correctives which age with its present equipment can apply to youth. On the contrary he asks their elders to welcome demonstrations of independence on the part of the young, particularly when accompanied by a disposition to criticize. The old have at least as much to learn from the variability of youth as the young have from the conventions of age. "Youth overvalues its raw power; age overvalues its own habits. The corrective for both is objectivity which is possible only through the policy of ever-renewed free criticism carried on coöperatively." "Such a discipline would demand of the mature as the very essence of a liberated maturity the practice by them of a neglected virtue—the virtue of confession and repentance." They cannot attain objectivity in relation to their own personal welfare and the welfare of their society unless they incorporate a persistently repentant disposition into their conduct of life. In no other way can they prepare themselves for what Mr. Coe takes to be the one trustworthy corrective for the ailments of modern youth—"conscious participation with God and their fellow men in the creation of a new order of society."

Throughout this argument Mr. Coe attaches a function to criticism which it will be difficult for many people to understand. Criticism is usually considered equivalent to dissent. It is taken to be the opposite of positive belief. It is the enemy of constructive human activity and the father of dissension, irresponsibility and inertia. Mr. Coe places a wholly different valuation on criticism. According to him it is the uncritical assertion of beliefs or ends which provokes dissension, irresponsibility and inertia rather than their critical assertion. To be tentative and relative belongs to the nature of specific beliefs and purposes. If we accept them uncritically, we compromise their fruitful relation to life. Beliefs are not oracles or commands; they are merely one of the necessary means of communication with other people. Their function is to open up the doors and windows from one structure of human behavior to another. By keeping them con-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

stantly exposed to criticism, we act as if human beings possessed undeveloped possibilities which we were not justified in subordinating to existing patterns and formulas. Criticism in this sense is the conscience of the human soul. It should accompany all the operations of mind as a benignant detective. Unless we assign to it the task of shadowing searchingly our traditions and ideas, life will always be struggling to escape from what we understand by truth, and truth will justify the attempt of life to escape by constantly threatening to confine life in a prison.

In fact we may, I believe, safely and usefully attach an even more constructive function to criticism, considered in its most essential aspect, than does Mr. Coe. Criticism, as he conceives it, helps to bring about social progress by persistently associating social activity and conviction with conscious inspection and revaluation. He expects by the practice of inveterate criticism to release the young people of America from subservience to a discipline which hinders them in coöperating with their fellows for the cause of social reconstruction. But if criticism in the sense of the inveterate conscious searching of our social behavior is as constructive as Mr. Coe claims, may we not, by setting up benignant detectives to search every process of individual behavior, accomplish for individual development a result analogous to that which Mr. Coe hopes to accomplish for society? Indeed, if the object of education is to prepare human beings to choose for themselves among several possible alternatives instead of disposing them to repeat preëxisting choices, do not the pupils need emancipation just as much from subservience to their own personal habits as from the prescriptions of society? Consciousness is the only agency which human beings may invoke to prepare themselves for novel specific responses to the demands of specific situations. May not education by cultivating the will and the ability to accompany individual as well as social behavior by disinterested, persistent and searching scrutiny enable its beneficiaries, both adult and adolescent, to *see through* their existing patterns of behavior and call to their assistance those possibilities in their physical inheritance which their actual experience has left undeveloped?

It would be foolhardy to answer these questions confidently and authoritatively on the basis of existing knowledge and experience. Only recently has education been conceived as a means of unfolding the undeveloped possibilities of individual and social life, and only very recently have educators begun to understand that the systematic critical reexamination of social institutions and patterns, instead of infecting social activities with awkward and apprehensive self-consciousness or paralyzing doubt, may be indispensable to the very survival of a progressive society. But if criticism, erected into a systematic discipline, seems to be an available method of objectifying the latent values of social life, it is certainly pertinent to inquire whether disinterested critical scrutiny, elaborated into a method for the conduct of individual life, may not perform an analogous service for individual development. Mr. Coe apparently expects to objectify the latent values of individual life as a by-product of social education, but a disinterested critical consciousness, as we know it, has no residence outside of individual minds. If it is capable of the constructive social transformation attributed to it by Mr. Coe, it surely must also be capable of increasing the significance and the range of those choices which give ultimate value to individual life. The question which I am asking is this: Is it possible to augment the objectivity and the versatility of the response of the individual mind to life by cultivating the range, the plasticity, the inveteracy and the intensity of the consciousness which the individual fastens on his own behavior? If it is possible, is it not of the utmost importance for educational research to consider the means whereby such intensification of consciousness can be brought about?

H. C.

Federalism as a Method

CONTROVERSY over the Child Labor Amendment appears to be developing into a general debate between those who oppose extensions of federal power on the one hand and those who favor such extensions on the other. This debate, reviving historic issues, may be prolonged and may have a decisive influence on national policy. It is of the utmost importance that it be conducted as fruitfully as possible; yet its present tendency is to lay undue stress on abstract principles and precedents, while the objects in view and the best means of attaining them are in danger of becoming fogbound in the confusions of the argument. It may be of advantage at the beginning to attempt to clear some of these confusions out of the way, in the light of economic realities.

One frequent confusion is that which mixes the argument for or against action by government with the argument for state as opposed to federal legislation. There are good reasons for believing that certain kinds of conduct cannot effectively be regulated by law. There are good reasons for favoring the regulation of certain kinds of conduct by social standards, by economic pressures, or by autonomous group action, rather than by political government. But such considerations are irrelevant to the question whether, if political regulation is desirable, it shall be applied by the state alone or by the federal

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

government as well. For instance, one may believe that prohibition is a dangerous policy, because it places upon government a task which it cannot execute. But that is no argument for state rather than federal legislation. In order to establish a case in favor of state as opposed to national prohibition one would, after conceding a general desirability of the measure, have to establish the dubious proposition that the individual states could cope with the task of eliminating widespread private habits and extinguishing a highly profitable industry better than could the federal government, or a combination of the two. And because federal prohibition of alcohol may be unpopular or impractical is no reason for opposing, say, federal prohibition of counterfeiting.

This confusion may be illustrated again by a contention of some intelligent opponents of the Child Labor Amendment to the effect that the best argument against child labor is that it is inconsistent with efficiency. This may be true; if true and generally believed by employers it might eliminate the need for legislation, either state or federal. But if an employer of child labor has, or is generally believed to have, a real competitive advantage, legislation of some sort would appear to be necessary. Whether it ought to be exclusively state or federal and state would depend in part on other economic factors such as the margin of the advantage and the extent of the competitive markets. According to the census of 1920, there were 39,000 children between ten and sixteen in textile mills, 12,000 in clothing manufacture, 13,000 in iron and steel mills, 10,000 in lumber and furniture factories, 7,000 in shoe factories and 6,000 in coal mines. Do these children cost more to their employers than would adults in the same operations? Perhaps, but it is hard to prove, and is not generally believed. Are the industries in which they work competitive across state borders? Apparently; unless opponents of federal legislation can prove the contrary they have a poor case.

General arguments against centralized social or economic control also do not necessarily imply a preference for state legislation. There is a widespread disposition to favor autonomy of social groups, the development of a limited or functional type of administration which is compatible with diverse needs, closeness to the problem in hand, popular education, economic power, effective responsibility. There is much to be said for this tendency. But it cannot be identified with a support of "local self-government" except in so far as the composition and interest of the groups in question are geographical, are limited to the several localities and can be sufficiently affected by local legislation. Even a brief glance at the important social-economic problems of modern society will show, I believe, that many of them concern groups which are primarily occupational rather than geographical in nature, and extend far beyond the boundaries of single states. Autonomy and self-government do not imply government solely by local geographical units. If, for instance, it were found desirable to prevent too much centralization of power by the bankers, and to distribute such power to other groups such as farmers or laborers, the chances are that federal legislation would be of more aid in the transfer than state.

A second type of confusion is that which arises from the assumption that there are two mutually exclusive principles—centralization and decentralization—only one of which can be generally applied. This confusion has roots in our political history, but it has little relevance to the present economic order. There are, for instance, distinctions which arise in business administration between what can best be done locally or by a limited group and what can best be done by centralized action. But the problem of drawing such distinctions is not solved by adopting an absolute principle of centralization on the one hand or of localization on the other, or even by favoring either tendency on general grounds. It is a problem of technique, which is solved by analyzing the purpose in view and relating the means to the end. Big business has encountered and decided this problem many times, as have other national units of economic administration such as trade unions and farmers' coöperatives. Economy of production is served by enlarging the unit of manufacture up to the point of maximum efficiency, and then establishing new units. Sales management or market policies may be more highly centralized than production. Financing may be more centralized than either. There has recently been published an extremely intelligent article by an executive of a national manufacturing corporation owning many plants, in which he shows how the policy control of the parent company is devised to fit the necessity of local decisions. This corporation manufactures hundreds of articles for competitive markets on which prices must be changed frequently in accordance with business conditions and sales requirements. To regulate such decisions wisely is a task vastly more complex than any which has been set for political government. It cannot be done solely either by central control or by local autonomy. Yet business has not given up the task, but has succeeded in establishing a national policy, related to its own major objective, which combines in a salutary way centralization with decentralization. If we should stop talking of centralization versus decentralization as principles, and instead consider how both as methods might best be combined to produce the results we want, we should make more progress in the science of political administration than we do.

A third confusion is that which fails to distinguish between the relative capacity of federal and state governments in administrative work and the necessary scope of effective political action in economic matters. It is sometimes said that the federal government is becoming topheavy because it is en-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

trusted with so many tasks and that it is not fitted to undertake more responsibilities. It is said that state governments may be more effective because closer to the problems and persons concerned. But that, if true, does not alter many economic situations which, if they are to be politically controlled, must be controlled on a national scale. We have realized that railroads, whose physical plant and operations cross state borders, must be regulated nationally. But many other important industries are as genuinely incapable of salutary regulation solely by state governments. Any industry buying or selling mainly in national markets cannot be well regulated in any way which materially affects costs or prices without the aid of the federal government. If the industry is competitive, the regulated competitors may suffer; if it is monopolized, it may escape regulation by moving its plants. If the plants are permanently localized, regulation in the interest of one state may seriously affect consumers in other states. In any case a reliance solely on state action brings about the illogical situation of political forces working on a different scale from economic ones, and perhaps at cross purposes with each other.

This is by no means an academic observation. Large-scale production and distribution of electric power, now coming to be of first importance, is interstate in nature. Either it will be developed in a disorderly way, or it will be controlled by private economic forces in their own interest, or it will be controlled at least in part by the federal government. The separate state governments are inadequate instruments of super-power regulation. Likewise it is impossible to conceive wise economic regulation of coal by the separate states, and coal is a notoriously sick industry which ought in some way to be regulated. Most of the basic industries are just as truly interstate as these, and if at any time political action concerning them should become desirable, federal action will be necessary. In addition to such admittedly national industries, there are rapidly growing national combinations of units, each of which serves a locality and is ordinarily conceived as a distinctly local concern. Chain stores furnish one example; the baking "trust" is another; even milk distribution is undergoing national consolidation. In such cases local regulation for some purpose may be effective, but even here difficulties arise because of the inferior power of the local political unit in comparison with the immense resources pitted against it. The experience of local communities in attempting to regulate public utilities which are controlled by large holding companies is a case in point. If it should be desired to regulate national policies of these concerns, such as decisions having to do with the allocation of capital, or with "vertical" combinations which go back from distribution to manufacture and raw materials, local action alone would be ineffective indeed. It may be good policy not to attempt much political regulation of industry. But if regulation is desirable, objections having to do with inefficiency of federal administration do not necessarily indicate that exclusive state regulation is better, because state regulation may in the nature of the case be insufficient. The necessary task may be rather to improve federal administration.

What I have tried to indicate is merely that dogmas in this field of discussion are as likely to be obstructive to accomplishment as they are in any other human activity. One might, admitting all that has been said, still make a case either for or against any specific extension of federal activity—though it would be a different sort of case from those usually put forward. But one would be wary of a generalized opposition to or support of such extensions. At present I believe there is far more danger from dogmatic opposition to the use of federal power than from dogmatic support of it. This arises from two considerations—the probable necessity of increasing economic control in the future, and the irrelevant obstacles of law, tradition and interest which make such extension extremely difficult. If we are to have political aid in the ordering of superpower, coal, distribution of commodities, and in other basic economic activities which are rapidly becoming more rather than less centralized, if we are to have a national system of employment exchanges, governmental unemployment insurance or other social legislation of national importance, if political instruments are to assist in the control of the economic surplus and the allocation of capital investments in such a way as to avoid waste and raise standards of living, we shall need the privilege of utilizing the federal government whenever and wherever its use will be of real help in such projects. One does not have to prejudge the desirability of this type of activity or to be a dogmatic adherent of centralization in order to see the importance of keeping the way open for possible use of federal power. And the difficulty of bringing about extensions of that power seems already too great without additional negative pressure from conscientious liberals, when we consider the disposition of the courts, the cumbersome process of constitutional amendment, the tradition of states' rights and the immense resources of the interests which oppose federal control, not because they want state control but because they want control by themselves. It is no accident that sincere liberals who oppose any specific extension of federal activity find themselves nine times out of ten on the same side with private interests and political machines which entertain totally different social purposes. This does not of itself invalidate the position of these liberal opponents, but it does place them under a special obligation to avoid generalizations of their attitude which are unwarranted by their aims or by the facts.

GEORGE SOULE.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Women and War

IN a basement in Washington not long ago five hundred ladies sat for a week and considered war, its causes and cures. Then they arose and went their several ways, to report what they had thought and heard to 5,000,000 other ladies whose representatives they were.

Anyone who wished to see that interesting specimen, the American clubwoman, at her best, could not have done better than to drop in at one of the sessions of this conference. These were officially selected delegates from nine important, national organizations* who had come together from all over the United States, paying their expenses out of their own handbags, because they believed that war is an undesirable institution and that intelligent study might well be applied to its origins and possible remedies. Most of them were middle aged and well gowned, the sort of person who is accustomed to being addressed as "Madam Chairman" in her own right, for all they sat so meekly now under other gavels. A few were very young and even better gowned—examples of that interesting species which the Y. W. C. A.'s and women's colleges are turning out in these equal-suffrage times, who cut their teeth on Robert's Rules, and lose their inhibitions before their pigtails.

Presiding over the five hundred were some of the notable figures in the contemporaneous history of women's affairs: Mrs. Carrie Chapman Catt, veteran of forty battlefields for equal rights, looking forward to forty more struggles for causes not less worthy, a woman with a mind like a nickel-plated dynamo, and a personality which, if you insist on interpretation in masculine terms, is a combination of Gladstone and Savonarola, with a dash of Disraeli; Mrs. Thomas G. Winter, past president of the General Federation of Women's Clubs, a job which requires twice the diplomacy of a Talleyrand, and eighteen times the integrity; Mrs. Percy Pennybacker, another past president of the G. F. W. C., the true Peter Pan of club presidents, who conducts a meeting as Mengelberg does an orchestra, with the wrists, and gets equally admirable results; Miss Belle Sherwin of the National League of Women Voters, with an intellect so cool and crystal clear that in its presence fuzzy-minded male "statesmen" shrivel up to nothing, like salted slugs; and many others who have been similarly schooled with nearly or quite similar results.

Chief of these results is efficiency without cynicism; this reporter, who has been attending public meetings of various sorts for a fifth of a century, wishes to make deposition that no group of men whom he ever saw or heard of can assemble and conduct affairs so competently and yet spiritedly as these ladies. It isn't merely that the meetings began and ended on time, or that thirty minute speakers spoke for thirty minutes; but that the participating audience also played its part incredibly well. Questions from the floor were really questions, not minority reports; and they showed that the preceding speeches had been listened to and understood, a phenomenon incomparable.

The convention, furthermore, was honest in its agenda. Some of the causes of war are considered proper themes for parlor orators, and some are not; and the ladies heard both sorts discussed. They heard, that is, about the threat of overpopulation as well as the threat of military mindedness; about immigration laws as well as the machinations of munitioneers; about not only the desirability of arbitration, but the menace of economic rivalry. And despite the fact that this conference was in no sense a "radical" one, that participation was carefully confined to organizations which are not, so to speak, professionally devoted to the cause of peace, that its speakers were nearly all the scientific-minded, expert variety,* the general tenor of the discussion, and the conclusions arrived at were about the same which would have been reached by a conference far less conservative in color.

It was interesting to note, for instance, that the representatives of these nine national organizations with their combined membership of 5,000,000 were overwhelmingly, almost unanimously, in favor of America's participating in the Permanent Court of International Justice. Though for sound diplomatic reasons they did not give official endorsement, they were almost or quite as unanimous in favoring America' joining the League. They gave every evidence, official and unofficial, of approving the Protocol of Geneva—by all odds the most radical plan ever considered by the great powers.

It was also interesting to observe that practically every one of the speakers shared these views. In the case of a few, of course, like Messrs. Hudson,

* These were the General Federation of Women's Clubs, the National League of Women Voters, the National Women's Trade Union League, the American Association of University Women, the National Board of the Young Women's Christian Association, the National Council of Jewish Women, the National Woman's Christian Temperance Union, the Council of Women for Home Missions, and the Federation of Women's Boards of Foreign Missions of North America.

* The list included President Coolidge, Judge Florence Allen, Prof. James T. Shotwell, David Hunter Miller, George W. Wickersham, Prof. J. W. Garner, Brigadier-General Lord Thomson, Major-General John F. O'Ryan, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, Pierrepont Noyes, General Henry T. Allen, Prof. Edward M. Earle, James G. Macdonald, John Foster Dulles, Bruce Bliven, William S. Culbertson, Dr. Beatrice Hinkle, Sir Willoughby Dickinson, Dr. Manley O. Hudson, Raymond Fosdick, Miss Grace Abbott, Prof. Herbert Feis, Rev. Anna Garlin Spencer, Dr. Julius Klein, Dr. Alice Hamilton, Dr. Mary E. Woolley, Mrs. Thomas Nicholson, Dr. Alfred E. Zimmern, Allen Wardwell, Prof. Pittman Potter, Prof. Donald Taft, Samuel G. Inman, Dr. Frank J. Goodnow and Prof. Warren Thompson.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Shotwell and Wickersham, this was well known in advance; but in the case of others, as Mrs. Catt was careful to point out, the speaker's attitude was not ascertained. He was asked to come because he was a recognized authority on some problem within the scope of the conference. The unanimity of these men in supporting America's participation in the existing League and the existing Court (some of them, of course, wanted reservations) was impressive if not surprising.

Another aspect which had both these qualities was the hostility displayed toward Congress, and particularly the Senate, and especially the attitude of the irreconcilables on foreign affairs. It appeared less in what the speakers said—though it was there—than in the applause they evoked. There is food for thought in the fact that five hundred such women hold the opinion they evidently do hold of the intelligence and honesty of a fairly large group of members of the Upper House.

Not the least striking aspect of the conference, and a refutation of the charge that women do not know how to conduct their business in a businesslike way, was the efficiency with which the facts presented before it were written into conclusions, and the groundwork laid for continuing action—action both in the detailed study of war's causes and cures, and in educating the general population as to what should, can and must be done if war is to be abolished.* The members of the conference were urged to seek the creation of local associations in their own communities composed of existing organizations of men and women, to work for peace. Also, each of the nine coöperating organizations will hold a special meeting in every state, at which the delegates who were present will make a full report on what they learned at Washington. The persons present at each of these 432 state conferences will in turn carry the news to their own cities and towns. The ladies mean business.

It is well, of course, to keep a sense of proportion in recording these activities. Wars are not abolished by ladies passing resolutions in the basement of a Washington hotel. The conference produced no monumental discoveries about the causes of war; and obviously, the study which lay behind the final report was superficial and hasty. It is gravely to be doubted whether anybody's mind was changed by sitting through the eighteen sessions. As usual, the preachers addressed their admonitions to the saved. The damned stayed away.

(In fact, some unrepentant pro-war professional patriots held a meeting of their own, after the conference had closed, in which they denounced what one of them, Captain Harold Spencer, gallantly called "the Catt Convention." Such serious and important allegations were made as that "the speakers before the conference with only two exceptions are present or past officials of the League, or would like to be"; and that "Mrs. Raymond Robbins, one of the persons present, once carried a red flag in Chicago." Mrs. Haviland H. Lund, who introduced the latter weighty news, promptly withdrew it on being assured from the floor that it was false.)

While we must not overrate the Conference on the Cause and Cure of War, neither must we underrate it. For it remains true that war will be abolished, if it ever is, by concerted action of governments; that governments will be no better than they are prodded into being by the citizenry behind them; that the citizenry will only bring pressure to bear when they know what is the matter and what needs to be done; and that no meeting to consider these latter points, in any country at any time, has brought into play greater intellectual and spiritual forces than were mustered for the Washington conference of 1925.

B. B.

---

* The report declared that "the basis of peace is an intellectual and spiritual problem" and called upon the people of the United States "to unite to break down national and racial prejudices and fears, and to build up a spirit of friendship and trust among the peoples of the world." It said that "the cure of war requires a permanent international organization as its instrument" and "while realizing that the final cure of war lies within the spiritual healing of the nations," recognized "the necessity for ameliorating agencies and activities of immediate service."

Several specific measures were advocated:

Work for the outlawry of war, including (1) enactment through an adequate agency of an international law declaring that war is a crime in which aggressor nations should be dealt with as criminal; (2) the use of international machinery through which such a law can become operative among all nations. "This involves and actually compels permanent world organization which shall be continuously operative."

The United States' adherence to the Permanent Court of International Justice.

The codification of international law.

The restoration in the Department of State of the United States of the office of Under Secretary of State for Peace.

Multiplying of such arbitration treaties as contribute to international conciliation.

The initiation or sharing by the United States in movements looking toward reduction of armaments.

While the conference did not advocate America's joining the League of Nations, it did "recognize the immense service rendered by the League to the ideals that are dominant in the United States," and added that since "it is the only functioning world organization providing for the realization of those ideals," our government "should enlarge our responsibilities in League plans and coöperate in its activities." And particularly, "inasmuch as the Protocol of Geneva is the most advanced proposal ever made for the outlawry of war," the United States should "hold itself ready to take sympathetic and coöperative action in the furtherance of the success of the Protocol."

In regard to economic causes of war the conference recommended international coöperation to the following ends:

General access to natural resources.

Development of international channels of distribution and agencies of communication.

Establishment of an industrial code between nations to set up minimum standards for conditions of employment, prevent the exploitation of labor of children and remove industrial injustices between competing nations.

To bring this about, it advocated international conferences on world resources, the distribution of raw materials, and the establishment of commercial and industrial codes. It suggested utilizing existing agencies, such as the economic section of the League of Nations and the International Labor Office.

The conference recommended work toward educating the public on behalf of peace, through the press, motion pictures and in particular, through the text-books used by school children.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

The Last Phase of Anatole France

ALREADY, since the death of Anatole France, two important books of memoirs have appeared. One of these, Anatole France en Pantoufles, is by M. Jean-Jacques Brousson, France's secretary during the preparation of the Vie de Jeanne d'Arc (1908); the other, Anatole France à la Béchellerie, deals with the last ten years of his life when he had retired from Paris to the country. These two books produce a rather different impression from the Propos d'Anatole France published three years before France's death by Paul Gsell. M. Gsell, with his antique phrases and his eighteenth century colophons, built up a full-dress effigy of the more popular side of France's literary personality. It is all "M. Bergeret," "M. l'abbé Coignard," "notre bon maître." The great humanist, on his days of reception, in his ornamental dressing-gown and skull-cap, is shown gracefully making game of stupidity and tranquilly vindicating truth. His large house in the Villa Saïd, with its elaborate furnishings and its museum of antiques, is described as "la chaumière du sage."

MM. Brousson and Le Goff, on the other hand, present more candid and more interesting portraits. Though the two books deal in general with quite different phases of France's activity—Le Goff reporting almost nothing but political conversations, whereas Brousson shows France chiefly preoccupied with women and objets d'art—they are in agreement in emphasizing certain phases of France's character which do not appear in Gsell. With much appreciation of France's brilliance and charm, which are preserved most vividly in both accounts, both writers are not unwilling to let one feel that, under his legendary attitude of tolerance and benevolence, they suspected the old man of insincerity, selfishness and even coldness. M. Brousson represents him as receiving his friends with warm embraces and effusions of enthusiasm and then ridiculing them in the most ruthless manner behind their backs. M. Le Goff taxes him with inconsistency in his political position: he cannot understand why France should have continued to profess Socialism when he had no longer any faith in the Socialists, why he should publicly have approved a communist revolution which would, in M. Le Goff's opinion, have proved fatal to everything which in private France most applauded and enjoyed, nor why, since he had been at pains to profess radical views in time of peace, he should have been so cautious about criticizing French policy during the War when criticism was most needed: when Le Goff spoke one day of France's collection of patriotic articles, Sur la Voie Glorieuse, France replied: "Yes, I have written and talked like my concierge. I'm ashamed of it, but it was necessary." So strongly does the conception of France as fundamentally self-centered and indifferent seem to have impressed itself upon M. Le Goff that even when he finds the old man in tears over the sudden death of his daughter, he cannot bring himself to believe in his sincerity but suspects him of having arranged a scene and reports a week afterwards with something like satisfaction that France's spirits are as good as ever.

France's death was the provocation for another document which presents a still more unconventional view of him. The former Dadaists, now for some time disbanded but called together again by this common cause, published on the day of France's funeral a leaflet entitled Un Cadavre. In this manifesto, the former standard-bearers of the slogan "Dada crache tout" charge France in the most insulting possible terms with a sterile and inhuman scepticism and characterize him as a cynic and a "sinistre bonhomme," at the same time that they try to turn him to ridicule by dwelling ghoulishly on the details of his illness and death. Having deliberately assumed the rôle of hyenas, they are pleased to reproach France for heartlessness. "Without God, without touching love!" declaims Pierre Drieu la Rochelle, as if with tears in his eyes, "without insupportable despair, without magnificent anger, without definitive defeats, without complete victories!" "That sceptic, that amiable sceptic leaves me cold," protests Joseph Delteil. "It is for passion that I become impassioned. It is optimism, faith, ardor and blood which arouse me!" They accuse him also of cowardice, of compromise, of traditionalism, of patriotism, of realism, of betraying the French Revolution in Les Dieux ont Soif, and of displaying an insufficient interest in the activities of the younger generation.

One asks oneself what reality may have lain behind all this. Why do Brousson and Le Goff both produce the impression that there was somehow something wrong with France's later years and why do the young French writers, even apart from the Dadaists, tend to throw him overboard altogether? The attitude of his biographers may be partially explained by the satisfaction which ordinary people feel in observing the infirmities of great men: Brousson, who is reported to have quarrelled with France, indeed carries his insistence on France's malice so far that we suspect him of having profited in this respect by the lesson of the Master; and M. Le Goff, who cannot understand that a man may remain loyal to a party yet at the same time be sceptical of all parties, is without doubt a case of a simple intelligence trying to grasp a complex one In the case of the young writers, every literary generation begins by repudiating the last, and the generation which have survived the War in France have no doubt special reasons for impatience with the

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

traditional French suavity, irony, moderation and devotion to the past which distinguish the insincerities of French official speeches and the banalities of the Academicians as well as the art of an Anatole France. Besides, even in the eighties, when it was new, France was not especially sympathetic with Symbolism; and they are all Symbolists now.

Yet France's later work, if one considers it apart from the rest, produces an impression which is not inconsistent with that conveyed by these biographers and critics. It is customary, in writing of France, to divide his career into two periods: before the Dreyfus case and after. In the first period, he is a kindly sceptic and fastidious connoisseur of ideas in imitation of his master Renan, whose attitude toward the origins of Christianity he dramatizes in Les Noces Corinthiennes, whose adventures in Sicily are said to have furnished the basis of Le Crime de Sylvestre Bonnard and who finally supplies France (in the preface to Drames Philosophiques) with the celebrated phrase about viewing human life with irony and pity which France is usually credited with having invented himself. With the Dreyfus case, his social conscience is aroused and he begins to interest himself in contemporary life: all his political pamphleteering and almost all his novels which deal directly with the contemporary world are included in the period between Le Lys Rouge and Crainquebille. Here—in Histoire Contemporaine especially—he strikes what is perhaps his most satisfactory vein: the indulgent smile of Sylvestre Bonnard has been rescued from sentimentality by the awakening of more vivid and personal feelings and the irony has not yet arrived at a pitch where it makes the pity sound insincere.

But about 1908, with the publication of Jeanne d'Arc, he seems to enter upon a new phase. In the preface to this history, after a discussion of patriotism and a prediction of the European war distinguished by a political acumen of which M. Le Goff reports many striking examples, France concludes as follows: "I have not been able to refrain from expressing on these important matters the truth as it appears to me; it is a great satisfaction to say what one believes useful and just." Can one help feeling that this note of complacent candor has already begun to ring false? There follows the elaborate history of Jeanne d'Arc with its realistic dryness and its relentless anti-clericalism—reworked, on France's own admission to Brousson, from an earlier version "written for the sanctimonious" and full of literary "pâtisserie." From now on France produces a series of books of extreme harshness and pessimism: L'Ile des Pingouins, Les Sept Femmes de la Barbe-Bleue, Les Dieux ont Soif, La Révolte des Anges—these strike a vein quite distinct from any of his previous ones. Here his ridicule becomes for the first time really ferocious. In these latter books there is not only much sensuality and little love but not even, what is surprising in France, much charming sensuality. Two of these, La Révolte des Anges and Les Dieux ont Soif, demonstrate the ultimate futility of such a revolution as France has in his public character been advocating by showing that it must eventually give rise to a tyranny as oppressive as the one it has displaced. And another, L'Ile des Pingouins, predicts the complete destruction of society by industrialism and the reversion of mankind again to the primitive life of the fields and forests with the whole miscarriage of civilization to be gone through with again. Even the Contes de Jacques Tournebroche—so dry and with so little real gaiety—are singularly unsatisfactory in a genre in which France has formerly been peculiarly happy. This is recognizably the man who is reported by M. Le Goff to have replied in answer to a question about the future: "The future? But, my poor friend, there is no future—there is nothing. Everything will begin the same again—people will build things and then tear them down and so on for ever. So long as men are unable to get outside themselves or to free themselves from their passions, nothing will ever change. There will be some periods which will be more peaceful and others which will be more troubled; men will continue to kill each other and afterwards they will go back to business again."

During the years of the War and after, France returned to the memories of his boyhood, which he had already made the subject of two earlier books. He is merely distracting himself, he explains, from the sad realities which surround him, and one feels throughout Le Petit Pierre and La Vie en Fleur an artificiality and a self-consciousness from which Le Livre de Mon Ami was free. What was once fresh and spontaneous is here repeated mechanically. Aside from a few fine pages in Le Petit Pierre the deliberate attempt to make a refuge from reality produces a rather irritating impression: France's youth has become so charming, so literary, that we no longer believe he is telling the truth about it. After Les Sept Femmes de la Barbe-Bleue, his naïveté has become fatally suspect. We know now from his conversations with Brousson the ugly and distressing realities of boyhood which he suppressed from this unctuous record. "L'on m'assure," he writes in the preface to La Vie en Fleur, "que ces bagatelles, sorties d'un coeur vrai, peuvent plaire." Here, even more sharply than in that other passage I have quoted from the preface to Jeanne d'Arc, we are shocked that the cynical and very subtle-minded old man should still attempt to pass himself off as a simple-hearted sage.

For it is not at the end of his career but at the beginning that France is most like Sylvestre Bonnard. He begins with a quite successful impersonation of Renan in his old age, but he ends both savage and despairing. His epicureanism, his humanitarianism, do not save him from profound chagrins —so profound that they have the effect of making both humanitarianism and epicureanism sound hollow. "If you could read in my soul," he tells Brous-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

son one day, "you would be horrified." "He took my hands in his own, feverish and trembling. He looked in my eyes and I saw that his own were full of tears. His face was all ravaged. He sighed: 'There is not an unhappier creature than I in the whole universe. People think me happy. I have never been happy—not an hour, not a day!'" The effect of both these books of memoirs, for all their intellectual richness and their humor, is distinctly a depressing one. One can almost sympathize with the younger men in their outcry against France: "Too many books! Too much old furniture! Too much self-indulgent epicureanism and imitation Socialism! Too much Pierre Nozière! 'Maigre, maigre philosophie!' Rimbaud, who refused these compromises and laughed at these consolations, is a nobler hero and a safer guide than this miserable old man!"

Yet these writers misunderstand France and fail to do him justice. France had spoken, as few great writers do, for a whole civilization, which he interpreted as well as led. The Dadaists accuse him of writing for the bourgeoisie and we find France precisely explaining to Brousson: "We are working for a bourgeois clientèle. That is the only one which reads. Do not snatch the veil from the temple with a brutal hand. Pluck it away a little at a time. Riddle it with sly little holes. Under the pretext of mending it, cut away here and there a few shreds to make dolls with. Leave to your reader the easy victory of seeing further than you. . . . They take me for an entertainer, a jongleur, a sophist. I have spent my whole life twisting dynamite into ornamental curl-papers." France is a perfect representative of nineteenth century France: with the logic and irony of the eighteenth century he combined a romantic sensibility which opened to him worlds of experience completely unknown to Voltaire. His love of beauty and his love of humanity, as he understood them and at least in middle life had felt them with passion, as well as his scientific scepticism, are so bound up with the life of his century that his critics, in writing about him, find themselves announcing the end of a period; books, politeness, objets d'art are all so much a part of the world in which he lived and which had nourished his genius, that his enemies, in dressing themselves against him, find themselves attacking a whole culture. Meagre philosophy, perhaps—but he had at least a philosophy. His successors have none. He had even in disillusion this great strength—the antithesis of Rimbaud's but no less quaint—of striking his roots into a people and an age. And his most destructive phase has surely less of indifference in it than of indignation: if he becomes malicious about life, it is because he has actually loved it. One feels that there has been a more generous warmth disappointed to produce the coldness of L'Ile des Pingouins than his critics have been able to muster in their most impassioned affirmations.

EDMUND WILSON.

Washington Notes

IT is certainly true that, among diplomats here, there is infinitely keener interest in prospective changes in the Coolidge attitude toward Russia than in war debts, or even reparations. I have recently been given considerable evidence that those in ambassadorial circles who see farthest into things are entirely convinced a change will come, once Mr. Hughes is out of the Cabinet.

They do not, of course, expect the President to flop over night, but they do believe his opposition to recognition of the Russian government will gradually soften until it finally disappears. The basis for this belief is easy to see. No one disputes that our inflexibility toward recognition was almost entirely due to Mr. Hughes. It may be polite to pretend that Mr. Coolidge made his own foreign policy and did not get his views from his bewhiskered Secretary of State, but it is also wholly untrue. No candid and informed person is under any delusion about the paucity of Mr. Coolidge's views on these subjects. They do not interest him like economy, domestic politics and patronage. It is pleasant and, perhaps, profitable for Republican organs and Mayflower newswriters to attribute this or that policy to the President. It may be that some of them believe that to continue the fiction that the President evolves these policies himself is giving to the office the "respect to which it is entitled." Be that as it may, there is not one among them with intelligence grading higher than a field mouse who does not know that, in the last eighteen months, every word and thought concerning foreign affairs uttered or entertained by Mr. Coolidge that did not come from Mr. Hughes, did come from Mr. Hoover. There is neither bias nor exaggeration in that statement. It is the plain truth—and those who dispute it are either very ignorant or very partisan, or very both.

Now, then, when Hughes, the hardened and unyielding opponent of Russian recognition, goes out, he will be succeeded by the elderly and nervous Kellogg, who will not impose his views very indelibly upon anyone. If he does anything other than hesitate and stutter about, waiting for guidance and avoiding friction, he will greatly surprise everyone here. The man from whom the President is much more likely to get his views on foreign policy is Senator Borah. Mr. Hoover is going to be far too busy running his two departments—Agriculture and Commerce—and there isn't anyone else. The power passes naturally from one strong man to the other. Borah, always a Russian recognitionist, has not been lacking in either the strength of his convictions or the power to express them. What he has not had was the prestige and position to make them effective. He is now not only supplied with both by virtue of the chairmanship of the Committee on Foreign Relations, but the departure of the inflexible Mr. Hughes removes a Secretary of State both able and willing to give him battle.

Combine his strong official position with the pleasant personal relations maintained by Senator Borah at the White House, and it will be surprising, indeed, if he does not make real progress in the next four years toward the Russian recognition he has so much at heart and deems so vital. It will be interesting to watch Mr. Coolidge under the new tutelage.

While I cannot vouch for the accuracy of the informa-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

tion, I am told that the real influence that brought about the appointment of Thomas M. Woodlock, of New York, as a member of the Interstate Commerce Commission, was none other than our old friend Frank A. Munsey. Mr. Woodlock has for some time been employed as a writer for Mr. Munsey's New York Sun, and the two are friends. This fact has nothing to do with Mr. Woodlock's qualifications. If it is true, however, it is interesting, for two reasons, one, because it shows who are the people who have influence with Mr. Coolidge, and the other, because it indicates a determination upon the part of Mr. Munsey not to permit the owners of the other faithful organs of the Republican party to monopolize things around the White House.

As to Mr. Woodlock, the outstanding feature of his selection is that Mr. Coolidge did the unprecedented thing of going straight to Wall Street to pick a Commissioner. As a former editor of the Wall Street Journal, Mr. Woodlock specialized in railroad analysis, and is regarded as an authority. The appointment, judging from the protests, is popular neither with the Democrats, to whose party Mr. Woodlock is supposed to belong, nor to the farmers in the West, who hope for a reduction in freight rates through the Commission. In reply to these protests, however, it seems pertinent to ask, what they expect of Mr. Coolidge anyhow? It also might be asked what difference it makes how Democrats and western farmers feel about it?

The administration leaders, from the President down, will breathe a soulful sigh of relief when finally Attorney-General Stone leaves the Department of Justice and takes his seat on the Supreme Bench. It is not that anyone doubts either Mr. Stone's rigid personal integrity or his profound legal attainments, but his absence of political flair or instinct is so complete as to be embarrassing to his best friends. The contrast between him and Daugherty is curiously striking. No one with any sense thinks there was anything sinister or dark or political in Mr. Stone's procedure in Washington against Senator Wheeler, just at the time the Senate was considering the confirmation of his appointment to the Supreme Court. It may or may not have been the right thing to do, but certainly Mr. Stone thought it right and thought it his duty to proceed. There is no question that he made a good impression upon the Senate committee before which he appeared and which subjected him to a right rigid cross-examination. But, politically, it was a silly thing to do. It certainly deepens the impression that Senator Wheeler is being persecuted not prosecuted. The bad smell of the first indictment in Montana procured under the Daugherty régime, made it perfectly natural for the Senate to suspect a similar revengeful purpose back of the new procedure. Mr. Stone may be personally acquitted of any such motive, but this move at this time, combined with other instances of political ineptitude and ignorance, certainly placed him well up in the front of any competition for the honor of being the world's worst politician. Upon good authority, I am told that even the pious Mr. Butler found Mr. Stone adamant to some of his suggestions as to changes in the Department, and, much to his annoyance, was unable to get the Attorney-General to "let up" on a meritorious Massachusetts friend of the President. There is no doubt that Mr. Coolidge has quietly but keenly suffered as a result of the inability of his Attorney-General to recognize that there are a lot of legitimate political tricks that have to be turned in his Department, and that they can be done without in the least departing from the highest moral standards. "He may be a great lawyer," said one friend of the President the other day, "but he is certainly a damned dummy politically."

I am told that, so far from being discouraged over what happened to the Democratic party in November, B. M. Baruch, who stopped in Washington a few days ago on the way home from his plantation in South Carolina, and conferred with a number of Democratic leaders here of the "Joe" Robinson and "Pat" Harrison type, is quite convinced that the Democrats, in the 1926 elections, not only can, but will, control the House and capture the Senate. This is not the view Mr. Baruch holds merely for publication purposes, but the one he actually entertains. He is, those who talked with him say, convinced that the inevitable swing of the pendulum back, is alone enough to insure a Democratic congressional victory. He sees a reaction against Mr. Coolidge, beginning about the first of 1926, and increasing as the session of Congress gets under way.

The interesting thing about the Baruch talk to the politicians is the indication that he may be expected to continue his pleasant habit of privately and confidentially contributing large sums to help out his friends in various states. So long as Mr. Baruch holds this habit, his popularity with Democratic leaders will not wane. I am also told that he denied vigorously and with considerable heat that his friend McAdoo is, as has been reported, already at work organizing McAdoo clubs for a renewal of his fight for the nomination in 1928. The further information is given that Baruch still adheres to the belief that unless "Al" Smith removes himself from the field, there is no Democratic hope at all in 1928. It would be interesting to hear "Al" on the subject of Baruch.

The farther the Republican leaders in Congress go with the "expulsion" of the LaFollette following from their party, and depriving them of their committee places, the clearer it is that, in the long run, the men most damaged will not be those "expelled" but those responsible for the "expulsion."

It is openly admitted now that it was a mistake to start, but, having done so, they must go to the finish. The thing that is happening is that Senate and House leaders are being placed in a position of such conspicuous and inexcusable inconsistency that they are dreadfully uncomfortable. Could there, for instance, have been a more embarrassing question than the one shot at Nicholas Longworth the other day in the House, when Congressman Frear asked whether he would have voted to "expel" his father-in-law, the late Theodore Roosevelt, who did exactly the same thing in 1912 that LaFollette did in 1924, and who took with him many of the men who now, under pressure from the administration, are engaged in throwing the LaFollette followers out. Mr. Longworth was utterly unable to reply. In fact, there is no reply. To say that, if Roosevelt were alive, he would admit that the Bull Moose movement was the "biggest mistake of his life," is too absurd to discuss seriously. Longworth did not say that. It was said for him, and the fact that that was the only attempt to answer the Frear question, is an indication of the weakness of the Republican position and the growing unhappiness of those forced to maintain it.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

CORRESPONDENCE

The Protocol and the Status Quo

SIR: In his characteristically suggestive article on Europe and the Protocol Prof. Alfred Zimmern attributes to the Geneva Protocol this "bold extension of the realm of law: the acceptance by the great powers in the League of *all* disputes, whether justiciable or non-justiciable. . . ." (italics mine). I submit that Professor Zimmern has overlooked a vital qualification to the scope of "law" provided for by the Protocol. The drastic exception to the acceptance by the great powers in the League of the Protocol's legal machinery for the settlement of disputes was thus expressed with commendable but ominous candor in the report of M. Politis in submitting the Protocol last summer to the Assembly of the League:

> There is a third class of disputes to which the new system of pacific settlement can also not be applied. These are disputes which aim at revising treaties and international acts in force, or which seek to jeopardize the existing territorial integrity of signatory States. The proposal was made to include these exceptions in the Protocol, but the two committees were unanimous in considering that both from the legal and political point of view, the impossibility of applying compulsory arbitration to such cases was so obvious that it was quite superfluous to make them the subject of a special provision.

This means, I take it, that the system established by the body of treaties which issued from the Paris Peace Conference cannot be called into question by any of its victims, but that, on the contrary, any resistance may make a victim State the "aggressor" and obligate the great powers "to coöperate loyally and effectively" to put down such resistance. Plainly this involves a most serious danger, to say the least, that the Protocol in its present form may become an instrument for stereotyping the post-War European settlements. It may well be argued that such an era of "peace" is worth the price to be paid for it. On the other hand, the dangers of the Protocol serve to explain the opposition of English liberals, as represented by the Nation, as well as of the British delegation to the recent meeting of the Executive of the Second International at Brussels. In any event, it will not do to say that by the Protocol the great powers have accepted "the peaceful settlement of all disputes." I venture to express the hope that Professor Zimmern will advert to this phase of the problem in a future number of the New Republic.

FELIX FRANKFURTER.

Cambridge, Mass.

Women and Progressivism

SIR: May I correct an impression which has prevailed in some quarters, and finds expression in an editorial paragraph in the New Republic of December 31, concerning the conference of women held in Washington on December 11 in conjunction with the meeting of the National Committee of the Conference for Progressive Political Action?

You state that "Among the problems particularly discussed at Washington was the future policy of progressive women. Should they form a completely independent organization of their own? Or should they remain inside the general group, insisting on complete equality with men?—something which they feel they by no means had during the campaign just closed. Both these points of view were strongly represented at the Washington gathering. Our own opinion is heartily in favor of the second course. . . Indeed equal participation and responsibility by men and women ought to be one of the principles of the Progressive party, if and when formed." This is incorrect and misleading.

An independent national organization of Progressive women already exists, having been formed last March, but it has never been proposed by anyone, much less "strongly represented" at the meeting, as an alternative to the work of women within the movement side by side with men. The only question raised in Washington was whether such a supplementary organization is still needed as a "feeder" to the general movement. Though the question did not come to a vote, the consensus of opinion was in favor of maintaining it because of its demonstrated value to the movement. The following outline shows the service that it has already rendered, and indicates its future place in the movement: The Woman's Committee for Political Action was organized last March with the avowed object of "stimulating women to political activity in the liberal movement." It immediately affiliated with the Conference for Progressive Political Action, thus becoming the *first* and *only* woman's organization represented in this federation of organization. Its secretary became the first woman member of the National Committee of the C. P. P. A. and twenty more women have since been appointed, most of them members of the Woman's Committee.

In April, May and June it extended its membership into forty-two states and had branches formed or organizers working in twenty-five states. As a result the committee was able to send thirty-six accredited women delegates representing seventeen states to the July 4 convention.

During the campaign the Woman's Committee became an integral part of the official "Women's Division." Its office was used as District La Follette-Wheeler Headquarters; its secretary served as secretary of the National Women's Division; and its state branches, where organized, were the basis of the Women's State Campaign organizations.

All through the campaign its members urged the equal representation of men and women on National and State committees, and a larger use of women speakers. Though the official recommendation of the Women's Division that the National Campaign Committee be enlarged to give equal representation to women, together with the names of the twelve women nominated to serve on the committee, received a "pocket veto," the principle of equal representation has at last been established.

At the conference of women held in Washington, December 12, the following resolution was unanimously adopted: "Resolved, that this conference recommend that whatever form of Progressive organization may be adopted, a cardinal principle of such organization shall be the equal representation of men and women who shall share equally in appointive and elective organization positions." At the meeting of the National Committee of the C. P. P. A. the day following, when the resolution was presented, it was voted that the committee urge "equal representation of men and women from the State Campaign Committee" at the convention in Chicago.

As evidence that the principle has really been accepted, Mrs. Mabel Costigan, chairman of the National Women's Division during the campaign, has been appointed acting joint director of Progressive Headquarters, and similarly it is hoped that in all the smaller units of the movement women will be chosen as joint directors.

The campaign over and this fundamental principle established, the Women's Committee for Political Action is again preparing to send delegates to the Progressive Convention, to be held in Chicago, February 21, and to its own Second Annual Conference which will meet there at the same time. At this conference the proposal to change the name of the committee to the National League of Progressive Women will be discussed. The main work of the meeting, however, will be to outline and launch an intensive educational program because the committee believes that upon organization and education will rest the success of the Progressive movement.

Does not such a record and such a program more than justify the maintenance of an independent organization of Progressive women, not as an alternative to the equal participation of men and women in the general movement, *for which first of all we stand*, but as a "feeder" and auxiliary educational organization?

ISABELLE KENDIG,
Executive Secretary, Woman's Committee for Political Action.
Washington, D. C.

Fire at Fairhope

SIR: The Arts and Crafts Building of the Fairhope School of Organic Education was burned at midnight January 11, and its valuable collections and study material lost; among them the chemical laboratory—the largest and best equipped in the state.

The Arts and Crafts Department of the school has been the one that has attracted the most interest among visitors to the school. The loss of the collection of pottery work, basketry, etc., that has been made during many years by teachers and pupils is irreparable.

The Executive Board of the Fairhope School Community is making plans to raise a fund of $10,000 for the erection of a new fire-proof building and to replace the equipment of the Arts and Crafts and the Science rooms. Friends of the school who wish to aid it should send their contributions to the undersigned.

A. G. T. JOSEPHSEN,
Chairman, Finance Committee, Fairhope School Community.
Fairhope, Ala.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Essentialism

IN its progress toward light and knowledge the human mind is handicapped by an eternal thirst for simplicity. The history of intelligence seems one long battle between the immortal, but feeble tendency to recognize that every new fact adds to the complexity of the world, and an equally immortal, unquenchable, but much stronger tendency to force order upon a complicated chaos. The inclination toward simplicity is almost irresistible, and few minds, once started down that incline, do not end at the bottom in a heap of beautiful theories, explanations, arrangements, disastrous cosmic blueprints. Many of our best intelligences are occupied solely in bending universal chaos to their private will for order. Life without explanations is unbearable, and so nearly everything is somehow explained. The explanations have gradually become more and more complicated, but most of them still represent a victory of the instinct for simplifying over the truth.

Therefore a delight in the richness of chaos, the possibilities of variety, the solidity of the inexplicable, is rare. This applies particularly to any sort of writing about people. The average biographer feels most successful when he has most "explained" his victim; the usual novelist creates a little ordered cosmos of his own filled with people about whom he knows everything; the nine-out-of-every-ten playwright moves his pawns about on a simple childish chessboard. All three know why their characters did everything they do, of what they are made, and their blood's color and their souls' temperature. The novel and the play have changed over and over again in their forms, but with great exceptions they have remained at core the same in the author's omniscience about his people, his imprisoning of them in a scheme of things always simpler than life really is. Every once in a while the younger crowd, in revolt at threadbare forms, storm and destroy these prisons, only to build upon the site of the burned Bastille new simplifications, orders, theories of their own which in turn become prisons too.

The Bastille is burning again today. The revolutionaries may conveniently be called Expressionists, and their creed would run something like this:

"We are tired to death of the old realistic theatre. We are sick of photography, of mechanisms, of the well-made play, of plausible entrances and exits, of the small paraphernalia of everyday existence, of slices of life, of distracting furniture, mental and material, of a trivial panorama of externals, of the accurate presentation of things as they seem, of all that is shallow, entertaining, faithful, unexploring. We want to reach the core of reality, the warm invisible heart behind the feeble surface pulse; we want to peel life like an onion of all superficial shells until we reach the ultimate secret. There is something behind the mere outward behavior and idiosyncrasies of human beings which it is our mission to reach. Since the surface lies, our duty is to translate the essential into dramatic terms. In our new theatre everything must mean something, and the meaning must be profound and important."

To this creed might be applied the name of Essentialism, or Heart-of-Onionism. As a belief, there is something to be said for it; as a producer of theatrical creations there is still something to be said for it, though rather less. It has given us several startling and stimulating plays, and others which are merely peculiar. Most of them, good or bad, tend in the same general direction. They rob us of individuals, and lean to substituting for them depths of human nature. They show us people growing upon the tree of generalization, and are more concerned with the vague tree than its multi-colored fruit. Their characters seem to be automatons, a new kind of automatons perhaps not so much in the grip of despotic craftsmen as in the clutches of Truths, Revelations, Life Forces which their creators have discovered, delved for, seized upon. Depersonalization, abstraction of characters mark the playwright as a tyrant whether his method be Essentialism or good old realism. Instead of the old formula of three acts, entrances and exits, actual dialogue, accurate furniture, we have a new formula of The Inner Truth. Instead of the old simple pattern of externals, we have a new simple pattern of internals. In either case the undying hunger for some kind of blueprint explaining, arranging, simplifying the world has won its usual victory over confused, uncertain, miscellaneous, inexplicable, gorgeous reality, and with that has succeeded in one more evasion of the fascinating problem, How to translate individual characters, real people, into something that shall also have real life as theatre. Both the Essentialists and the old realistic fogies they despise are victims of the same passion for simplification; both, by entirely different roads, have arrived at the same destination.

The Provincetown group have just treated us, it is hard to see why, to an intolerably ponderous and stupid example of what the urge to strip things to their innermost core can do when it really gets loose. The Provincetown has produced a number of brave or interesting experiments, but Beyond is not one of them. The author, Hasenclever, one of the wildest, by all accounts, of the young German innovators, has stripped his twenty-two scenes and two actors of all that we had believed went to make a play, in a merciless striving to reach intense essentials, and has substituted nothing but rarefied dialogue with occasional lapses into thick slices of ham theatricals. The opening scenes are arresting, almost entirely thanks to the beauty and strangeness of the lighting and setting. Those little squares of picture, brief flashes of simple unworldly color, seem to be taking place many miles above the murky familiarity of this earth. A woman stands looking at blue emptiness through a window with shutters but no walls, a man stands upon a roof silhouetted against stars and sky. So far so good. But when they speak, that is, as soon as Hasenclever gets to work again, the ghost of speech falls from their lips, and with the white-sheeted disembodied language numbness invades us. Heavy, monotonous, dreary words. . . "What is reality? . . . We are spirits . . . I must leave you," pouring on and on, an unearthly, meaningless, etherealized interchange in which the occasional mention of such material things as "rats," "tea," "wagons," sounds shockingly gross. The two actors, Helen Gahagan and Walter Abel struggle faithfully with this profound rubbish. Mr. Abel, rather monotonous and lifeless, seems more in the spirit of Beyond than Miss Gahagan, who gives us flashes of beauty and emotional depth too human for Hasenclever's intention.

Before the end of the twenty-two scenes the play-goer, rather excited at the very beginning, is as completely sunk as if he had sat through an extra inning game in which all the players fouled out in succession.

Hasenclever, burrowing down to essentials, has achieved the simplicity of a fog, and most of a fog's other effects upon the human system.

ROBERT LITTELL.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

Constitutional Metaphors

The Constitution of the United States, by James M. Beck. New York: George H. Doran Company. $3.

EVEN before the Eighteenth Amendment books about the United States Constitution were apt to be pretty dry. They usually tell what the Supreme Court says in a lot of cases and try to show how what it says in one case will jibe all right with what it says in the other cases. After the writers tell what happens in each case, then they try to forget it and to put all the cases together and make up a set of rules to show what the Supreme Court has been up to and what it is going to do next. This is a very hard thing to do and it is very hard to read after it has been done. You have to think very hard all the time and even then you get all mixed up. This kind of book makes you tired because you have to try so hard to think, and so you usually stop trying to read it.

The new book which Mr. Beck has written about the Constitution is a very different kind of book. You can read it without thinking. If you have got tired trying to read the other kind of books, you will be glad of the nice restful book that Mr. Beck has written. It runs along like a story in a very interesting way. Most of the story is about how the Constitution got made. This is really history, but it is written in a very lively way like a novel, with a great many characters, almost all male, and plenty of conversation and a very exciting plot. Many of the chapters have names like those in a novel, such as The Opening of the Battle, The Crisis, The Dawn, Nearing the End, The Curtain Falls, and others. Besides the story there are many quotations from Shakespeare, Beethoven, Horace, Isaiah, Euripides, Beard and other famous men. Many of these quotations are quite old, but some of them seem fairly new. They help to make the book a really high class book. There is not much more to say about the part of the book that tells how the Constitution got made, except that it is fun and easy to read and seems pretty true to life.

The rest of the book is about what a good Constitution it is and how bad it is to make changes in it. The main reason why it is so good is because it was made by such good men. Mr. Beck says very nice things about them. He calls them "a group of gentlemen of substance and honor" and he thinks that "all apparently were inspired by a fine spirit of self-effacement." They kept their ears a good ways from the ground as gentlemen of substance and honor should, for Mr. Beck says that "they represented the spirit of representative government at its best in avoiding the cowardice of time-servers and the low cunning of demagogues." This means that they were the kind of men who would do what they thought was best for all the people without trying to find out what the people thought was best for themselves. Some of the people in those days who were not gentlemen of substance and honor had been trying to do very foolish things and it was partly to stop such foolishness that these good men came together to make the Constitution.

It was this foolishness of the men who didn't make the Constitution that made the men who made it make it such a good Constitution. This was the second main reason why it is so good. It is what Mr. Beck has in his mind when he speaks of "the anterior necessity of those who had property interests to protect themselves against that spirit of social revolt which we today call 'bolshevism.'" If these men who made the Constitution had not been so full of their "fine spirit of self-effacement," they might not have seen so clearly what was the best thing to do. But they did. Mr. Beck says that it was because of the hard times that we got such a good Constitution. This was the third main reason. Of course the hard times couldn't give us a good Constitution all by themselves, but you can see how much they helped when you read Mr. Beck's book where it says:

> It is therefore true that the Constitution was born of an economic travail, and that its merits were largely determined by the commercial necessities of the American people. It was largely the work of men of affairs; for most of the members of the Convention were influential, and, for the times, well-to-do professional and business men, who felt that, if their property interests were to be safeguarded and prosperity were to return after the panic of 1785, there must be, not merely freer commercial intercourse between the States, but also greater security to the rights of property against the disintegrating social tendencies, due to the distress among the masses, which, then as now, inevitably follows a depreciated currency.

I never knew what the Constitution really is until I read Mr. Beck's book. He says that "it is something more than a written formula of government—it is a great spirit. It is a high and noble assertion, and, indeed, vindication, of the morality of government." It is splendid to have a Constitution like that and to know, as Mr. Beck tells us, that "to the succeeding ages, the Constitution will be a flaming beacon." This is not all that it is, for Mr. Beck says also:

> I have elsewhere likened the Constitution to a Gothic cathedral, like that of Rheims. Its foundations seem secure, even though some of its buttresses may be weakened and its statuary mutilated. Nevertheless it remains a noble and serviceable temple of Liberty and Justice. Let us hope that, with the present indifference of the masses to the Constitution and the spirit of innovation of this restless and impatient age, that the time will not come that the Constitution will be as the Cathedral of Rheims when the author saw it in the summer of 1916. Rheims was a noble but pitiful ruin. Its high altar had been overthrown, and its glorious rose windows hopelessly shattered.
>
> The high altar of the Constitution is the self-restraint which the American people of 1787 were wise enough to impose upon themselves, and their posterity, and the rose windows are those great traditions of Liberty which we have gained at an infinite sacrifice of treasure and life from our English-speaking ancestry.

It helps us to know what the Constitution is if we know what it is not. It is a beacon and a Gothic cathedral, but it is not a rock and it is not a beach. Instead of these things it is a floating dock. Mr. Beck puts it very beautifully when he says:

> The Constitution is neither, on the one hand, a Gibraltar rock, which wholly resists the ceaseless washing of time and circumstance, nor is it, on the other hand a sandy beach, which is slowly destroyed by the erosion of the waves. It is rather to be likened to a floating dock, which, while firmly attached to its moor-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

> ings, and not therefore at the caprice of the waves, yet rises and falls with the tide of time and circumstance.

You might think that a Constitution which is all these wonderful things would be sure to last forever without any help from anything else. But this is not so. Mr. Beck says that it would not have lasted so long as it has if it had not been for the Supreme Court which he says is "the balance wheel of the Constitution." He has a whole chapter which he calls The Balance Wheel and this chapter ends up by saying:

> But always the Supreme Court stands as a great lighthouse, and even when the waves beat upon it with terrific violence (as in the Civil War, when it was shaken to its very foundation), yet after they have spent their fury, the great lamp of the Constitution—as that of another Pharos—illumines the troubled face of the waters with the benignant rays of those immutable principles of liberty and justice, which alone can make a nation free as well as strong.

It makes you see how marvelous the Supreme Court really is when it can be a balance wheel at the beginning of a chapter and a lighthouse at the end.

Even if you are not interested in the Constitution for its own sake, you will like to read what Mr. Beck says about it because he is such a lovely writer. He is the kind of writer who likes to write just for the sake of writing. He shows how he loves his work. He is not one of those writers who have to stop in their writing while they are making up their minds what to say. You can read him right along because he is so simple in his thoughts. He does not get you all mixed up the way so many writers do, but he brings up in your mind beautiful pictures of the Constitution as a temple and a beacon and a floating dock and he lets you see the Supreme Court shining and balancing in a very wonderful way. I have read a great many books about the Constitution, but there is no other book that has given me just the same kind of pleasure that this one has.

You will have a very happy feeling while you are reading Mr. Beck's book, until you come to the last three chapters. Then you will begin to feel sad. The ending is not a happy ending. It tells of dangers that will hurt our country if we do not look out. It is not enough to have a Gothic cathedral with a balance wheel. We must all be wise and good men who will not make changes. This is like so many books that have a moral lesson at the end. On his very last page Mr. Beck tells us what we should do. He says that when the Constitution came out of the safe in the State Department a few years ago, "the ink, in which it had been engrossed nearly one hundred and thirty-seven years ago, was found to have faded." He hopes that this is not a bad sign. This is what he means when he says that "all who believe in constitutional government must hope that this is not a portentous symbol." Just hoping will not help any, and it would not do any good to put fresh ink on top of the ink that is fading. We must do something different from that. Mr. Beck tells us very plainly what we should do when he says that "the American people must write the compact, not with ink upon a parchment, but with 'letters of living light'—to use Webster's phrase—upon their hearts." That must be a very hard way to write, and I should think it would be a good thing to write the ink letters as well as the light letters, because the light might go out before the ink had all faded.

THOMAS REED POWELL.

Restoration Comedy

The Life of William Congreve, by Edmund Gosse. Revised and Enlarged Edition. London: Heinemann. 7s. 6d.

Restoration Comedy, 1660-1720, by Bonamy Dobrée Oxford: Clarendon Press. 6s.

OF Mr. Gosse's book, now enlarged, revised, and containing one poem not yet printed in Congreve's works, one may say what one may generally say of Mr. Gosse's books; that it is competent, well informed, and discreet; full of demure fun, pleasant phrases ("he passed through the literary life of his time as if in felt slippers"), and good sense. The standard, of course, is not the highest. He does not create a character when he writes a biography; he does not penetrate to the depths when he writes a criticism. But his pages are completely free from the extravagance of the creative, or the turbidity of the profound. He enjoys to the full "the charming pleasure of easy composition"; and Congreve, of whom little is known, and that mostly to his credit, is a subject well suited to his urbane and skilful pen.

Mr. Dobrée has attempted with marked success a more difficult task. He has tried to give us a general view of comedy in the period from Etherege to Farquhar, and has succeeded in putting forward a variety of suggestive and interesting ideas from which we may proceed to further discovery on our own account. Chief among them are that Restoration comedy expressed "not licentiousness, but a deep curiosity, and a desire to try new ways of living"; and that it was "of English growth and would have existed substantially the same had Molière never lived"—both sayings which lead us to put our Wycherley and our Congreve to the test of reading afresh. Licentiousness is, of course, a chameleon quality which changes from age to age. Not so very long ago London playgoers had a chance of analyzing their own attitude in the matter when The County Wife was performed. Of that twentieth-century audience few were shocked, but it is safe to say that some were bored. It became plain indeed, as the favorite topic was harped upon in scene after scene, joke after joke, that indecency loses its savor sooner, is less fertile and profound, than more normal topics once the shock of novelty has worn off. Yet it was obvious, too, that indecency was as essential a part of Wycherley's genius as the crust is of the loaf; nor can we agree with Mr. Dobrée in making "a deep curiosity and a desire to try new ways of living" the begetter of that peculiarly irresponsible and very English love of bawdry. We doubt, indeed, whether in the matter of indecency there is much to choose between the Elizabethan and Restoration comedy; save that Elizabethan indecency is put away from us and disguised by the poetry, and Restoration indecency brought home and laid bare by the prose.

But the change of subject in Restoration comedy is, of course, undeniable. And here Mr. Dobrée makes a subtle distinction. The "atmosphere" remained English; but the "life" owed much to the French. The French civility had penetrated into the English drawing-room; the language was more expressive and the manners more refined. But the genius which gave color and tone to the whole re-

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

mained English, and far more closely related to the Elizabethan than to the French. No one, indeed, who compares The Plain Dealer with Le Misanthrope can fail to be aware of some of the fundamental differences which separate the two races. Where the French suggest, the English explain; where the French generalize, the English particularize; where the French give us in Alceste a type of man's disillusionment and the vanity of society, the English give us a burly sea captain who is far better fitted to polish off a Dutchman with his own fists than to stand apart and meditate the worthlessness of mankind.

Etherege, Wycherley, Dryden, Shadwell, Congreve, Vanbrugh, and Farquhar are all dealt with in Mr. Dobrée's book with a brevity which is full of point, though some contortions of wit are needed to keep the matter within the space, and we confess to thinking that those antiquated weapons—rapier, singlestick, and bludgeon—as articles of comparison have served their day. But the book has the prime merit of lighting up a corner of the library which had grown, not altogether owing to our fault, a little dim.

VIRGINIA WOOLF.

Psychology Comes of Age

Psychology. Lectures-in-Print, by Everett Dean Martin. New York: The People's Institute. $3.

MODERN Psychology has been developed by graft. This proposition holds for both figures. Practically all that bears the marks either of science or of modernity in psychology has come to it from other growths and been grafted onto the ancient and wholly run-down stock of the study of the soul. Indeed, a contemplation of the gnarled, misshapen trunk leads one to suspect that we give the ancients too much credit. It is one thing to honor them for the undoubted insights that were theirs. It is another to realize that the sciences we have developed most rapidly are those they hardly touched, whereas our most backward and delinquent charges are those we inherited fully formed from them. We have pruned and fertilized and grafted, and still the old sap sours our contemporary apples. Psychology is still struggling, in this day of electrons and gravitationally warped geometry, with the roots of that same animism from which, if we may believe Frazer, (though anthropologists do not!) the primeval mythologies originally sprang. It is not surprising, therefore, that psychologists have practiced wholesale graft, lifting the property of other scientists right and left without due process of law.

The result, very naturally, is confusion. When one opens a book about psychology one can never be sure whether it is going to be a redressing of primeval animism or a barefaced misappropriation of zoölogy or neurology or psychiatry or an intemperate entanglement of all of them. Nor is the confusion alleviated by the recognition that it is inevitable. There is a quip, current among biologists, that any student who is majoring in psychology ought to major in neurology. By this method, agreeable enough to neurologists, psychology would nevertheless be lost. The anatomy and physiology of the nervous system is not a substitute for a theory of human character and human behavior. To this extent the conservatives who cling to the ancient descriptions of the soul (alias mind, alias consciousness) are quite justified. These [illegible], however moss-grown, still symbolize human nature as a whole, the whole man coming into being, developing his temperamental peculiarities and working out his destiny in his native habitat of social institutions. Psychology can never find itself by trading this birth-right for a mess of neurones.

But the neurones, also, are indispensable. Unfortunately, psychology cannot find its way by denying that it is lost. Sooner or later it has got to accept all the implications of modern science. The foremost of these is, of course, that man is an animal species. In dealing with him no mysterious principles or unique inward processes can be allowed. If the special sciences do not suffice, neither can they be denied. The neurones demand their toll.

The joy that hails the discovery of such a book as Mr. Martin's is a reaction from this confusion. At last, apparently, psychology is coming of age. Here is a writer who has been able to achieve the apparently impossible; he has been able to respect psychology without denying science, to follow science without forsaking psychology. There is no major problem which he has not faced. At the very outset of his course he faces, and vanquishes, the two-headed monster of psycho-physical parallelism. Psychology, he says, is wholly dependent upon physiology. Yet psychology must deal with processes that are beyond the reach of haemostat and scalpel, not because they are mysterious or occult or "interior" in any "spiritual" sense, but simply because they are of a different order of magnitude. The data of physiologists and psychologists are, Mr. Martin says, "two views of the activity of the same being," both equally objective. Suppose an automobile is passing. There is the mechanic's view. The click is wrist pin; the knock, carbonized combustion chambers. There is also the traffic officer's view. The car is speeding. But it is a doctor's car, and he is heading toward the hospital. Here is a parallelism. But is it a parallelism of unassimilable axioms? I do not think so.

Proceeding in this fashion, Mr. Martin is able to give "consciousness" its due without succumbing to the lure of the inexplicable. Consciousness as "soul," as a unique principle distinct from all creation, is insupportable and must be exorcised. Consciousness as the integrated individual behaving as a human being is the indispensable basis of all psychological theory. There are some psychologists who would doubt the wisdom of retaining even the word, so soiled is it by its service with tawdry theology. But that is merely a matter of taste. The essential point is that a basis has been found for the study of the integrated personality to which the most rigorously scientific behaviorism can be readily assimilated. The author accordingly moves straight on to these contemporary problems. Behaviorism has no terrors for a mature psychology. Neither has psycho-analysis. Neither have instincts and habits. Most of the instinct literature is perversely wrong because it has represented instinct as the open sesame of behavior. Nevertheless, instincts or not, all human activity is built upon various basic reactions and behavior patterns. Psycho-analysis has indulged in strange excesses, yet it has done distinguished service in calling attention to the subtlety and complexity of the adjustment of human temperament. Behaviorism has been rash in many of its presumptions, but the realization of its program of a completely objective, biological account of all bodily activity must be welcome to every psychologist.

At this point, perhaps, the limitations of medium are most troublesome. These are lectures-in-print, composed

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

New Books

ESSAYS IN FRENCH LITERATURE
By George Saintsbury

It was an early essay of Baudelaire which first drew attention to Mr. Saintsbury's fine gift for criticism and opened the way to literary success for him as a young man. That essay is in this volume with others on Flaubert, Chamfort and his enemy, Rivarol, Saint-Euremond, Renan, Quinet, Gautier and Anatole France, besides a group of men less known. $4.25

A CONCISE ETYMOLOGICAL DICTIONARY OF MODERN ENGLISH
By Ernest Weekley

A book of riches for the man who wishes to know more about the words we use in speaking and writing. By the well-known author of "The Romance of Words." $3.00

ADVENTURES IN PERU — By C. H. Prodgers

A fascinating account of travel, exploration and adventure in South America. "All sorts of men knew him," writes R. B. Cunninghame Graham in *The Spectator*, "from the President of Peru, himself a man of countless adventures . . . . to the rough sailors, herdsmen, dealers and storekeepers of whom Prodgers has left us almost as great a gallery as did George Borrow in his amazing Bible of Spain." $4.00

THE ORIGIN AND EVOLUTION IN RELIGION — By Albert Churchward

Author of "Signs and Symbols of Primordial Man." Covers the course and evolution of religious thought from the first human beings through some 600,000 years, showing how greatly all religions today are indebted to the elaborate Egyptian religious system. $15.00

THE REFORGING OF RUSSIA
By Edwin W. Hullinger

Mr. Hullinger takes up the story of Russia where most writers have left off—with the inauguration of the New Economic Policy in 1921. His book is a realistic and constructive picture of Russia today. $3.00

New Fiction

REAMER LOU — By Louise Forgione

A remarkable first novel which presents an unforgettable picture of the actual life of the young foreigners dumped by the hundred at the Battery each year; a dramatic and powerful revelation of the life of the hot-blooded men who fight and love and work along the water-front. $2.00

WE — By Eugene Zamiatin

Translated from the Russian by Gregory Zilboorg

KENELM DIGBY writes in *The Literary Review:* "We are in duty bound to say that Eugene Zamiatin's 'We' is going to be one of the most startling novels of the year, one of the funniest, one of the saddest, and one of the most original. . . . It finds intense drama in a little self-sufficient world hog-tied by ultimate standardization . . . . Read it by all means." $2.00

THE DOOM WINDOW — By Maurice Drake

The author of WO_2 stages here an enthralling story of love and commercial intrigue seen through the rich glow of 14th century stained glass windows. An exceedingly novel and gripping story. $2.00

TONGUES OF FIRE — By Algernon Blackwood

Brilliant tales of imagination of strange places and strange people by the "master of mystery." $2.00

New Volumes of the Broadway Translations

MARTIAL'S EPIGRAMS

Translated by J. A. Pott and F. A. Wright. Twelve books of witty scathing criticism of the early Roman Empire in all its luxury and vice. $5.00

LACLOS' DANGEROUS ACQUAINTANCES

Translated by Richard Aldington. Lytton Strachey describes it as "a witty, scandalous and remarkable novel revealing on every page a most brilliant and concentrated art." $5.00

THE ORIGIN OF CONTINENTS AND OCEANS — By Alfred Wegener

Professor of Geophysics and Meteorology at the University of Graz, Austria. *$4.50*

THE ELEMENTS OF COLLOIDAL CHEMISTRY — By Herbert Freundlich

Fellow of the Kaiser Wilhelm Institute of Physical Chemistry and Electrochemistry. *$3.00*

SPACE AND TIME — By Carl Benedicks

Formerly Professor of Physics at the University of Stockholm. *$2.00*

CRYSTALS AND THE FINE-STRUCTURE OF MATTER — By Friedrich Rinne

Professor of Mineralogy in the University of Leipsic *$4.20*

The To-day and To-morrow Series

ARTHUR BRISBANE, probably the most widely read editorial writer in America, says: "Intelligent men and women will read with interest two little books recently published: These two little books will well repay a few hours reading. And that reading should result in the kind of THINKING that makes reading worth while."

DAEDALUS and ICARUS
By J. B. S Haldane — **By Bertrand Russell**

SIMEON STRUNSKY in the New York *Times Book Review*, adds: TANTALUS, by Dr. F. C. S. Schiller, published since Mr. Brisbane's article appeared, and largely a commentary on both. He says: "The concern of all three is what men must do to prevent the extinction of civilization. Once upon a time Science was the sufficient answer to questions about the future of man. To-day Messrs. Schiller and Russell affirm bluntly, and Mr. Haldane is inclined to believe with heservations, that Science is the chief peril that confronts us."

"Small in size," says *The Literary Review* (New York *Evening Post*), "but tremendous in importance."

Price $1.00 each.

Have you read this enchanting book?

When We Were Very Young

Verses by A. A. MILNE. Illustrated by E. H. SHEPARD.

THE NEW REPUBLIC: "It is a greatbook . . . written, obviously, by one of those persons who doesn't all of him, grow up."

E. P. DUTTON & CO., Publishers, 681 Fifth Avenue, N. Y.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED

on the lecture platform, recorded by stenographers, and afterwards revised by the author and published as a series of pamphlets. Altogether, presented in a neat cardboard box, they make a very decent book of nearly two hundred and fifty pages of actual text. Yet they are not really a continuous narrative or argument. Between lectures the audience is dismissed. With each chapter the author makes a fresh start. The result is after all a collection rather than a book. The method and point of view are quite continuous, but the chapters do not coalesce. Compared with another still more recent expedition in the same direction, Professor Kantor's Principles of Psychology, the first volume of which has just come from the press of Alfred Knopf, Mr. Martin's lectures are a series of inspired hints. Where the Principles of Psychology builds up a compact body of theory, rivetting each part securely into place, so that each theoretical strut supports and depends upon the rest, these lectures give rather the effect of scaffolding. Occasionally a plank swings loose. Thus it is with the treatment of behaviorism. With all his receptivity to the scientific method Mr. Martin still inclines to strain at the rejection of "images." But that is absolutely quintessential for behaviorism. "Images," the little pictures of the "mind," are traffic with the soul.

But it is hardly fair to apply to a series of introductory lectures the razor edge of criticism which the treatise challenges. The lectures-in-print are not the careful elaboration of a post-Watsonian psychology. For that the reader must go to Mr. Kantor. But they are an extraordinarily readable prospectus, a significantly inclusive survey of the promised land of the psychologist.

C. E. Ayres.

The Shirt of Flame

The Shirt of Flame, by Halidé Edib. New York: Duffield and Company. $2.50.

THERE are some books which are important despite themselves. The Shirt of Flame is one of those. As a novel it aborts, but as a work from the pen of Halidé Edib Hanum on the struggle into being of the new Turkey, its significance cannot possibly be denied. Turkey has no better book to offer, and no more devoted or celebrated spokesman, to pierce the mistrustful inattention of the West.

Halidé Edib Hanum was the first Turkish graduate of Constantinople College. To carry the radical ideas which seethed in her head she wrote the first novels ever written in Turkish, and became famous, not to say notorious, for her opinions about women, her intrepid appearances in public, her alliance with the liberal party in politics. During the War she worked in the Red Crescent, and, after the Greek invasion, in Anatolia with the forces of the Angora government. Here she did service of every description, from carrying messages to soldiers' wives to founding orphanages, and from the things she witnessed on the "Smyrna road" she derived her idea for the present novel. She is now acclaimed a national heroine by everyone in Turkey, from peasants to cabinet ministers, a prophet with honor in her own country and that alone invests her writing with a certain importance.

The Shirt of Flame, symbolic of willing martyrdom, is meant to interpret to the Turks themselves their national ordeal of the Angora revolution, the Greek invasion, and the battle of Sakaria. As a result, so much background of Turkish national pride and passion is taken for granted that it is hard always to follow the sympathies of the story, or to be moved at the proper spots by its somewhat erratic intensities. The American, to be quite blunt, does not get it, not as a story. But he does get a very decided secondary impression that there is something there. Devotion to country, pity, sacrifice, heroism—these things he understands and recognizes here. There is very little difference in romantic appeal between this national struggle and the glorious revolution of the Greeks, or the Risorgimiento, or our own cherished revolt. The idealism and the courage are all there. If the Turks have drawn no Byrons or Brownings from the West it is because the West has refused to see anything in their recent history but impertinence and deceit; yet the future they have managed to lay for themselves on the bare hills of Anatolia deserves the enthusiasm of nations which call themselves civilized. What the Turks have won, against their own weakness and the strength of their enemies, what they have suffered and felt and hoped to win, deserves at least to be understood. The infidel Turk has remained an unquestioned iniquity for a good long time. The Shirt of Flame, poor or not as a novel, offers a chance to break through that fiction to the flesh and blood of modern Turkey.

E. V.

Little Novels of Nowadays

Little Novels of Nowadays, by Philip Gibbs. New York: George H. Doran Company. $2.50.

SIR PHILIP GIBBS continues to preach the Gospel of Liberalism in this collection of short stories, written to depict the social and spiritual conditions prevalent in all quarters of Europe since the war. We wish Sir Philip would recognize the power and excellence of his "reporting" and stop cherishing an inferiority complex on the subject of "journalism." Our own theory as to why his short stories are so much less convincing than his observations and comments is that he exaggerates the power of fictional presentation, and is timid before a strange technique. These stories recall how thrilling their author's "propaganda" can be when he forgets to humble himself before literary conventions and fires to his revelation of political truth.

D. B. W.

Errata: In an editorial entitled Doing Something for the Farmer published in our issue of December 31 the percentage of decrease in the world wheat production for 1924 as compared with 1923 was put at 1 percent. The correct figure is 10 percent.

F. Stringfellow Barr is assistant professor of history at the University of Virginia, not professor of history, as stated in Part II of our issue of February 4.

Contributors

Edmund Wilson, who was formerly managing editor of Vanity Fair, collaborated with John Peale Bishop in writing The Undertaker's Garland. His play, The Crime in the Whistler Room, was produced by the Provincetown Players this year.

Thomas Reed Powell was formerly managing editor of The Political Science Quarterly. He is the Ruggles professor of constitutional law at Columbia University and was visiting professor of constitutional law at the University of California, 1923-24.

Virginia Woolf, daughter of the late Sir Leslie Stephen, is a contributor to English literary journals. She is the author of The Voyage Out, Jacob's Room, and other novels.

LICENSED TO UNZ.ORG
ELECTRONIC REPRODUCTION PROHIBITED